

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October, the last issue being a double number; the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

M. PLATNAUER, M.A., B.Litt., Brasenose College, Oxford.

B. L. HALLWARD, M.A., Peterhouse, Cambridge.

Board of Management:

Prof. A. J. ROBERTSON, M.A., *Chairman, representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (*Hon. Treas.*)

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A.

Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A.

F. K. SANDS, M.A. (*Hon. Sec.*)

Prof. R. E. WARMINGTON, M.A.

*Representing the Com-
mittee of the Classical
Association.*

R. A. BARRER, M.A., F.S.A.,
*representing the Oxford Philological
Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University,
Prof. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. J. L. MICHIE, Brisbane University.

Vol. XXXII

JULY-OCTOBER, 1938

Nos. 3-4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ΗΡΥΑΙΣ and ΗΡΥΑΕΕΣ	H. L. LORIMER 129
THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE <i>Περὶ Τέχνης</i>	G. C. RICHARDS 133
NOTES ON EURIPIDES' <i>IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS</i>	A. Y. CAMPBELL 135
THE SOURCES OF DIODORUS SICULUS XVIII	N. G. L. HAMMOND 137
THE CONSTITUTION OF DRACONTIDES	J. A. R. MUNRO 152
THE PSEUDO-PLATONIC SOCRATES	DOROTHY TARRANT 167
PHILODEMUS ON <i>ETHOS</i> IN MUSIC	L. P. WILKINSON 174
ARISTOTLE'S HYMN TO VIRTUE	C. M. BOWRA 182
THE GODS IN PLATO, PLOTINUS, EPICURUS	A. H. ARMSTRONG 190
A NEW COLLATION OF THE TEXT OF EURIPIDES IN THE JERUSALEM PALIMPSEST	J. A. SPRINGER 197
SIDE-ENTRANCES AND <i>HEPIAKTOI</i> IN THE HELLENISTIC THEATRE	W. BRARE 205
NOTES ON HERODOTUS—III	J. E. POWELL 211
<i>MACTARE</i> — <i>MACULA</i> ?	O. SKUTSCH AND H. J. ROSE 220
INDICES	224

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for single numbers, 4/- net (4/2 post free); for double numbers, 6/- net (6/4 post free).
Yearly Subscription 16/- post free; U.S.A. \$4. Combined Yearly Subscription for the
CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25/- post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE ORESTEIA OF AESCHYLUS

Edited, with an Introduction, a Translation, and a Commentary in which is included the work of the late WALTER G. HADLAM

By **GEORGE THOMSON**

In two volumes. 25s. net each

Vol. I. Introduction; Greek text and parallel verse-translation;
Apparatus Criticus.

Vol. II. Commentary; Metrical Appendix; Supplement; Index.

This edition of the *Oresteia* has been prepared in the belief that the first condition for understanding these three plays is that they should be studied together. The two volumes may be purchased separately, and the first has been designed so that it may be of use to students of literature who do not know Greek.

THE SKY-RELIGION IN EGYPT

By **G. A. WAINWRIGHT**. 8s. 6d. net

This book should appeal to all who are interested in classical studies, for it justifies so many of the statements of Herodotus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Eusebius, Josephus, Syncellus, and others, and makes it clear that Sky-worship was not confined to the Aryan world. The author devotes special attention to the cults and myths of the ancient Egyptians and shows that the late, organized state-religion has been allowed to obscure the far older beliefs from which it evolved.

THE GREEKS IN BACTRIA AND INDIA

By **W. W. TARN**. 30s. net

The story of Eastern Iran and Northern India under Greek rule, treated not as part of the history of India, as it has always been, but restored to its proper place in Hellenistic history. Dr Tarn's sources include fragments of lost histories—Greek, Indian, and Chinese—coins and the evidence of excavations.

DEMOSTHENES

The Origin and Growth of His Policy

By **WERNER JAEGER**. 10s. 6d. net

Sather Classical Lectures

Without Demosthenes it is impossible to understand the intellectual and political struggle of Greece in the fourth century B.C. This book aims at a reinterpretation of Demosthenes' orations as the authentic documents of his political thought and action.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

T

dou
mai
auth
prol
Tha
pos
well
a da
πρὸς
Boe

in c
reco
may
sche
the
Eph
whic
clea
war
com
a co
natu

obvi
On
of '
T h
diffi
of a
and
πρὸς
So f
Hon
oster
were
and
inap
that
anac

¹ M
'roun
² A
wher
ever
tauto
tio de

NO

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY-OCTOBER, 1938.

ΠΡΤΑΙΣ AND ΠΡΤΑΕΣΣ.

THAT the words *πρύλις*, *πρυλές* belong to the Cypriot dialect cannot be seriously doubted; the statement still occasionally encountered that they are Cretan rests mainly, as will be shown below, on the arbitrary and ill-judged emendation of the authoritative text which ascribes them to Cyprus. If *πρυλές* is Cypriot, it is *a priori* probable that it should be added to the Achaian element in the vocabulary of Homer. That both words survived from Achaian days in the Doric of Crete is perfectly possible. That the dialect of a central district absorbed various Achaian forms is a well-known fact, established by inscriptions from Eleutherna and Axos; the name of a dance in general use might pass into the common speech of the island. Whether *πρυλῆσι*, explained by Hesychius as *πεζοῖς ὀπλίταις*, represents a similar survival in Boeotian, or more probably Laconian, it is impossible to say.

Apart from *Scut.* 193, which is merely an epic echo, *πρύλις* apparently occurs in extant literature only in Callimachus (*H.* i. 52, iii. 240). The first passage records how the Kouretes danced it round the infant Zeus on Mt. Ida; this may perhaps indicate that Callimachus knew the word as a Cretan γλώσσα. The scholion on the line vouchsafes no more than *ἐνόπλιον ὄρχησιν*. In the second the Amazons dance it around the image of Artemis which they have erected at Ephesus, first *ἐν σακέεσσιν ἐνόπλιον*, and then *κύκλῳ*. That the term *πρύλις* (in which no special aptness is here discernible) applies to both phases of the dance is clear, firstly from the position of *μὲν* and *δέ*, and secondly, because both are equally warlike.¹ Though Schreiber's emendation *ἐν στιχέεσσιν ἐνόπλιοι* is unwarranted, a combination of dancing in opposing ranks and dancing in a ring may be intended; for a comparison with the dance represented on the Shield of Achilles (*Σ* 599 ff.) would naturally occur to the reader.

πρυλές occurs five times in Homer (*E* 744, *Λ* 49, *M* 77, *O* 517, *Φ* 90). *πεζοί*, an obviously appropriate explanation, is given on *Λ* 49, *πεζοὶ ὀπλῖται* on *M* 77 by Schol. A. On *O* 517 and *Φ* 90 neither A nor B makes any remark; in both cases the meaning of 'foot-soldiers' is not inappropriate, though 'soldiers' would do equally well. T has no scholion on *Λ* 49, *O* 517 or *Φ* 90. On *E* 744, a passage whose special difficulties do not concern us here, A has *πεζοὶ ὀπλῖται*, B *ὀπλῖται* alone, in the course of a note explanatory of other difficulties. In T substantially the same note appears and *ὀπλῖται* in the course of it; at the end however there is the following note:—*πρυλῆς δέ, ὀπλῖται ἢ πρόμαχοι ἢ ἄθροοι*, which we also find in Hesychius s.v. *πρυλῆς*. So far all that we have had is a series of explanations of the relevant passages in Homer, except that in this last note *ἄθροοι* is inappropriate to the text which it ostensibly glosses; *πρυλῆς* here must be a noun. It looks as if *πρόμαχοι* and *ἄθροοι* were conjectural alternative explanations of other passages, *ἄθροοι* probably of *Λ* 49 and *M* 77, *πρόμαχοι* possibly of the same, possibly of *Φ* 90.² That *ἄθροοι* is wholly inappropriate to *E* 744, *O* 517 and *Φ* 90, and *πρόμαχοι* to *O* 517, strongly suggests that both are mere guesses. *πεζοὶ ὀπλῖται* on the other hand (if we admit the anachronistic *ὀπλῖται*) fits every passage;³ it means simply *ὁ στρατός*, excluding the

¹ Moreover, the dance of the Kouretes was 'round' the infant Zeus.

² As Hermann thought, *Opusc.* iv, pp. 289-90, where he adduces T 411-12. Combined however with *πρώτοις*, *πρόμαχοι* seems to involve a tautology. The passage occurs in the *Dissertatio de Hyperbole* (p. 46), 1829.

³ In strictness it should perhaps be said with reference to *E* 744, where multitudinous *πρυλῆς* are said to form the decoration of the helmet of Athena, that as we have no comparable object *in corpore*, we have no clue to what was in the mind of the poet.

small number of chiefs and charioteers. This appears also to be the sense in which it is used by the poet of the *Scutum*.

On M 77 T makes a unique contribution, οὕτως Γορτύνιοι, confirmed by Eustathius ad loc. (p. 893, 34), who evidently drew on the same authority: πρυλές οἱ ἐν μάχῃ πεφοί, κατὰ γλῶσσαν Γορτυνίων, ὥς φασιν οἱ παλαιοί. These are the only two passages which attribute the word to Crete.¹

Far more important is the information given by Schol. T on the passage beginning at Ψ 130:—

Ἀριστοτέλης φησὶ τοὺς πρυλεῖς Ἀχιλλέως <εὐρημα>. τοὺς δὲ Ἀχαιοὺς τὸν νόμον εἰς Κύπρον κομίσαι. τῶν γὰρ βασιλέων κηδενομένων ἀντὶς προηγείται πυρρίχων ὁ στρατός.

This finally settles the question of dialect, for it is evident that Aristotle is describing a contemporary practice at royal funerals in Cyprus. In Rose's edition of the fragments of Aristotle this passage, for reasons to be explained presently, does not stand where we should expect to find it under the heading Κυπρίων πολιτεία; we do however find there another quotation of some interest derived from Harpocration:—

ἄνακτες καὶ ἄνασσαι. οἱ μὲν υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καλοῦνται ἄνακτες, αἱ δὲ ἀδελφαὶ καὶ γυναῖκες ἄνασσαι. Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Κυπρίων πολιτεία.

Evidently Aristotle recorded at some point in that work features of Homeric usage which still survived in Cyprus in his own day.

The extract in Schol. T occurs in a fuller form in a scholion on Pind. *Pyth.* II. 127 which after some sentences associating the ἔνοπλος ὄρχησις with the Dioskouroi and its practice with the Lakonians runs as follows:—

διέλκεται δὲ ἡ τῆς πυρρίχης ὄρχησις, πρὸς ἣν τὰ ὑπορχήματα ἐγράψαν ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν φασὶ τὴν ἔνοπλον ὄρχησιν πρῶτον Κουρήτας εὐρηκέναι καὶ ὑπορχήσασθαι, αἷθις δὲ Πύρριχον Κρήτα συντάξασθαι, Θαλήταν δὲ πρῶτον τὰ εἰς αὐτὸν ὑπορχήματα. Σωσίβιος δὲ τὰ ὑπορχηματικά πάντα μέλη Κρηταῖκά λέγεσθαι. ἔνιοι δὲ οὐκ ἀπὸ Πυρρίχου τοῦ Κρητὸς τὴν πυρρίχην ὠνομάσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως Πύρρου ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις ὄρχησαμένου ἐπὶ τῇ κατὰ Εὐρυπύλον τοῦ Τηλέφου νίκῃ. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ πρῶτον Ἀχιλλεῖα ἐπὶ τῇ τοῦ Πατρόκλου πυρρῇ τῇ πυρρίχῃ κεχρησθαι, ἣν παρὰ Κυπρίους φησὶ πρύλιν λέγεσθαι, ὥστε παρὰ τὴν πυρὰν τῆς πυρρίχης τὸ ὄνομα θέσθαι.²

This unmistakable testimony was obscured by Bekker, who in his *Scholía in Homeri Iliadem* (1825-27) altered—as we must infer—the reading of Schol. Vict. on Ψ 130 from εἰς Κύπρον to εἰς Κρήτην. The point cannot be absolutely established without an inspection of the MS. of Schol. Vict. at Munich, for Bekker allowed himself a free hand. He concludes his preface to the *Scholía* with the statement that he produces the edition without a critical apparatus for fear of overloading it, but that his conjectural emendations are few; the inconvenience arising from the fact that they could not be identified does not appear to have struck him. His responsibility in this case however is practically certain. Maass, who completed the edition of Schol. A, B and T undertaken by Dindorf for the Clarendon Press and was responsible for vols. V and VI (Schol. T), was able to demonstrate the correctness of Heyne's opinion that Schol. Vict. was merely a remarkably faithful copy of the scholia of T, made for Petrus Victorius during the sojourn of the MS. in Florence. That it diverged on the point in question is highly improbable. In defence, or palliation, of the change thus smuggled into the text it may be pointed out that Bekker had before him the statement of Eustathius quoted above,³ on the strength of which Blomfield in his edition of Callimachus (1815) had accepted πρύλις as a Cretan word (ad *H. Jov.* 52), and that he would certainly find in Schol. Vict. the

¹ On E 744 however Eustathius (600, 45 ff.) writes with reference to the helmet of Athena:— ἡ κεκοσμημένην τοῖς τῆς Κρήτης ὅπλιταις, τοῦτεστι τὰ τῶν Κορυβάντων ἔργα, ἔχουσιν ἐντετυπωμένα, ὅτι δὲ ἐκατόμυκτος ἡ Κρήνη καὶ ἐν Ὀδυσσεῖα δηλοῦνται. ὡς δὲ καὶ Κρήτες οἱ Κορύβαντες δῆλον καὶ αὐτό. The

bishop has confused his authorities: actually he should have quoted not T 174 but B 649.

² Schol. Vet. in *Pindari Carmina*, ed. Drachmann, 1910.

³ L.c. supr., p. 130, n. 1.

comme
differe
royal f
conside
the fir
of E 7
notice

It
Bekker
1870 p
edition
natural
does ou
the lips
lay han
under t
in the c
referen
scholar
brough
for the
makes
(1886)
import
vol. I²,
enough
attentio
advanc
more
Callima
works
πρύλις

It
πρύλις
As thei
word a
mately
hypothe
of then
women
associa
already
enough
in orde
import
a singl
large h
Kouret

¹ He
1820 hav
British M
² L.c.
³ The

comment of Schol. T on M 77—οὕτως Γορτύνιοι. On the other hand a scholar of a different type would not have missed the significance of the allusion to contemporary royal funerals; and one less encyclopaedically occupied might have found time to consider the scholion on Pindar, generally available since the publication in 1819 of the first part of vol. II of Boeckh's edition.¹ Hermann² in an interesting discussion of E 744 ff. accepted *πυλῆες* as Cypriot with a reference to Boeckh and took no notice of Bekker.

It might have been supposed that after the publication of Schol. T (1887-88) Bekker's emendation would sink into oblivion. Unfortunately V. Rose, who had in 1870 produced his edition of the fragments of Aristotle designed to complete Bekker's edition of the philosopher, under the heading *Κρητῶν πολιτεία* (numbered 476) naturally gave the scholion from Schol. Vict. with Bekker's 'emendation'. (Why does our language lack so desirable a word as 'immendation', known to me only on the lips of a contemporary scholar?) It was almost inevitable that he should then lay hands on the Pindar scholion, emend *παρὰ Κυπρίους* to *παρὰ Κρησὶ* and insert it under the same heading; and though the change is duly recorded, without ascription, in the critical apparatus, the fact that it is printed in the text, which is headed by a reference to Boeckh, gives it a *faux air* of having originated with a more eminent scholar. In 1886, just too early to profit by the publication of Schol. T, Rose brought out an *editio minor* of the fragments in the Teubner series, thus ensuring for the now twofold error (appearing under 519) the widest possible circulation. It makes an unfortunate appearance in Leaf on E 744 (*Il.* I², 1900); his first edition (1886) had preceded the publication of Schol. T, and though he appreciated its importance in some respects (vol. II², pp. xv and xvi) and quotes it on occasion (e.g., vol. I², p. 423), he does not appear to have used it systematically. This is natural enough, for his task was in any case a heavy one, and between 1886 and 1900 the attention of Homeric scholars of a progressive type was largely preoccupied by the advance of archaeological discovery and the problems to which it gave rise. It is more disconcerting to find the error maintained in a note by A. W. Mair on Callimachus *H. Jov.* 52 in his edition in the Loeb series, published in 1921. In the works of linguistic experts it finds no place; both Hoffmann and Bechtel assign *πυλῆες* to the Cypriot and to no other dialect.

It remains to account, if possible, for the belief of some of the ancients that *πυλῆες* and *πυλῆες* were Cretan words, i.e., that they existed in the Doric of Crete. As their etymology is obscure, the first possibility that suggests itself is that both word and institution were Minoan, subsequently adopted by the Achaeans and ultimately by the Dorians of Crete. There is however no evidence in support of the hypothesis. Though dances in plenty are represented in Cretan works of art, none of them bears any resemblance to the pyrrhic;³ the performers in fact are generally women. Probably one important factor in determining ancient opinion was the association of the *ἐνόπιος ὄρχησις* with the admittedly Cretan Kouretes. As has already been implied, there is no trace of these beings in Minoan art; strangely enough, there is almost none of the Divine Child. He must have existed in theory, in order to appear at a later stage as the Divine Consort; but can hardly have been important in cult or myth, since his appearance, none too certain, in art is limited to a single seal-impression which exhibits a boy, not an infant, in company with a large horned sheep.⁴ It seems reasonable to associate the later prominence of the Kouretes with the wave of religious enthusiasm which swept over Greek lands in, as

¹ He might even on his visit to England in 1820 have inspected T, available since 1812 in the British Museum.

² L.c. *supr.*, p. 129, n. 2.

³ The military interpretation of the procession

on the famous 'Harvesters' vase from Hagia Triadha has been generally abandoned, and the alleged weapons are regarded as agricultural implements.

⁴ *P. of M.* III, p. 467, fig. 326.

is generally supposed, the seventh century, and which had one of its points of departure in Asia Minor. The Anatolian affinities of the Kouretes were patent to the ancients, as is shown by their identification with the Korubantes.

There is however another possible reason for the ancient attribution of the *πρύλις* and consequently of the pyrrhic to Crete. We have read in the scholion on Pindar that Thaletas of Gortys was the first to compose hyporchemata for the pyrrhic. We learn from Plutarch¹ that in consequence of a Pythian oracle he was summoned to Lakedaimon to expel a pestilence by the exercise of his art, and that together with four other poets from different regions he created the second school of music at Sparta. Further, he instituted or reorganized the Gymnopaidia of Lakedaimon, an 'agon' whose patron was Apollo. Nilsson² has shown that as it was held in the Agora,³ the god concerned was Puthaeus, whose statue stood with those of Leto and Artemis in the market-place. Gortys had a temple of Apollo Putios,⁴ and as the same form of the god's epithet occurs in Arcadia and Pamphylia,⁵ it would seem that the cult in all three localities must originally have been Achaian. Moreover, there was in Gortys an Amuklaion,⁶ testifying to the cult of that Apollo who is found as Amuklos in Cyprus.⁷ It must have been carried to both places by the Achaians, who at some stage in their history had superimposed it on that of the indigenous Hyakinthos at Amuklai in Peloponnese. Plainly Achaian elements survived in Gortys; among them may have been the word *πρύλις*. If it was under this title that Thaletas of Gortys brought his hyporchemata to Sparta, the fact may have been recorded and so become known to Glaukos of Rhegion, who may have mentioned it in his account of the poet. From this or a similar source the statement of the Scholiast and of Eustathius on M 77 that *πρυλίες* was a *γλῶσσα* of Gortys may be ultimately derived; so, too, Callimachus may have learned the word and its alleged origin. That elsewhere the name pyrrhic served to describe the same dance seems certain. It was used by Archilochus,⁸ an older man according to Glaukos than Thaletas, for he supported, perhaps originated, the view that derived it from the name of Achilles' son and his dance of triumph over the slain Eurypylos. Under whatever name Thaletas introduced his novelty, as the pyrrhic it lived on at Sparta, retaining its primitive character; in late antiquity it was there and there alone that it was still a military dance.⁹ This may already have been the case in the time of Aristoxenos and may have been his reason for attributing its invention to a Pyrrichos, not of Crete, but of Laconia,¹⁰ and it may have been thence that the name, originally alien, as far as we can see, to Crete, was reflected back to it.

H. L. LORIMER.

SOMERVILLE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

¹ Plut. *de Mus.*, 9, 10, 42.

² *Griechische Feste*, p. 141.

³ As stated by Hesychius s.v. *Γυμνοπαῖδια* and ap. Bekker, *Anec.* I, p. 234.

⁴ Collitz and Bechtel, vol. iii, 2, Crete 5016, 19.

⁵ Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, I, p. 396.

⁶ Collitz and Bechtel, op. cit. 4991, III, 7

(The Laws of Gortys). 'Αμυκλαῖοι (5025. 4) suggests that Gortys had a deme named 'Αμυκλαί.

⁷ Bechtel, op. cit. I, p. 454; Hoffmann, *Gr. D.* I, p. 67, No. 134. 4.

⁸ Bergk 190.

⁹ Athen. 631A.

¹⁰ Athen. 630E.

It i
proof th
tutor of
vincing
put out
Suidas
Caeciliu
φιλάτωρ
Romans
date for
written.
writer, y
paper to
Dic

χαίρειν),
found in
Geminu
acquain
copy of
which I
Plato.
Dionysi
many p
style, b
with ap
hieroph
self and
letter v
mediate
embellis
ἐπιτευχ
their few
εὐτυχθ
I do no
possible
ness as n

No
stature,
all rise
possesse
(μεγαλο
but grea
What r
a single
and mas

¹ See
pp. 302-3

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE *Περὶ Ὑψους*.

It is hardly necessary to recapitulate Rhys Roberts' cumulative and convincing proof that the treatise 'On the Sublime' was not written by Cassius Longinus, the tutor of Zenobia, but belongs to the early days of the Empire. Not the least convincing of the arguments for this date is the fact that the treatise is suggested by and put out as a substitute for the *Περὶ Ὑψους* of Caecilius of Calacte,¹ who according to Suidas taught rhetoric (*ἱεροφίστευσε*) in Rome in the time of Augustus. Now Caecilius was an intimate friend of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ἐρ. ad Pomp.* 776 τῷ φιλάτῳ Καικιλίῳ): they were both Atticists and fellow-workers in leading literary Romans back to the best models of Greek prose style. But Dionysius is no candidate for the authorship of the extant treatise, which is not one that he could have written. On the other hand he gives a plain indication by which to identify its writer, which Rhys Roberts mentioned but did not adopt. It is the object of this paper to put this identification seriously forward.

Dionysius wrote a letter to one Gnaeus Pompeius (*Διονύσιος Γναίῳ Πομπηίῳ χαίρειν*), whom he also addresses as *ὦ βέλτιστε Γεμίνε* (an accentuation which is to be found in *Rom. Ant.* V 58). But as there is a MS variant *Γναίε*, the cognomen Geminus must be given with reserve. Pompeius and Dionysius were not previously acquainted, but had a common friend in Zeno, who had furnished Pompeius with a copy of Dionysius' work. The object of the scholarly letter (*εὐπαιδευτος ἐπιστολή*) which Pompeius addressed to Dionysius was to protest against his treatment of Plato. That he is himself a Greek is probable because he writes in Greek. Dionysius in his reply (*Ἐρ. ad Pompeium*) sticks to his guns. Plato, who criticized so many people himself, is not above criticism. He is extremely charming in the plain style, but in the elevated style he is too figurative and dithyrambic, and he quotes with approval the saying of Demetrius of Phalerum, 'There is a good deal of the hierophant about him'. But he contends there is really no difference between himself and Pompeius, and then to prove his point quotes this passage from Pompeius' letter verbatim: 'In other forms of writing there may well occur something intermediate between praise and blame, but in the elaborated style (*ἐν τῇ κατασκευῇ* "in embellishment", Rhys Roberts) whatever is not success is entire failure' (*τὸ μὴ ἐπιτευχθὲν πάντα ἀποτυγχάνεται*). 'So that in my opinion these men should be judged not by their few most hazardous attempts but by their innumerable successes' (*ἐκ τῶν πλείστων καὶ εὐτυχηθέντων*). 'Although I could defend all or at any rate most of these passages, I do not venture to gainsay you. But this one thing I strongly affirm, that it is not possible to succeed greatly (*μεγάλως ἐπιτευχεῖν*) in any way without such daring and recklessness as must needs fail (*σφάλλῃσθαι*) now and then'.

Now let us turn to c. 36 of the *Περὶ Ὑψους*, where we read: 'Men of this stature, though far removed from faultlessness (*τοῦ ἀναμαρτήτου πολλὴ ἀφεστῶτες*), yet all rise above what is mortal (*ἐπάνω τοῦ θνητοῦ*). All other qualities prove their possessors to be men, but sublimity raises them near to the mighty mind of God (*μεγαλοφροσύνης θεοῦ*). No failure no blame (Apollonius Rhodius is *ἄπωτος* c. 33. 4): but greatness excites admiration (*τὸ μὲν ἄπταιστον οὐ ψέγεται, τὸ δὲ μέγα καὶ θαυμάζεται*). What need to add that each of these great men often redeems all his failures by a single sublimity, a single success, and (most important of all) if one were to pick out and mass together the failures of Homer, Demosthenes, Plato and the other greatest

¹ See *American Journal of Philology* XVIII. 3, the *Sublime*, pp. 7 and 220-2. pp. 302-312, Rhys Roberts, and his *Longinus on*

writers, they would be found to be a very small part, nay an infinitesimal fraction of the successes those heroes everywhere achieve?' The coincidence of opinion is so striking that it can only produce a conviction that in Pompeius we have the author of the Περὶ Ὑψους. After his skirmish with Dionysius, he must have set himself to read Caecilius' treatise with his young friend Terentianus and himself (partly to vindicate his beloved Plato) to produce a better substitute.

That Pompeius was a Greek is likely from the fact that he writes in excellent Greek, and it is equally probable that he is a Greek rhetorician resident at Rome. 'He may or may not', says Rhys Roberts, 'have been associated in some way with the house of Cn. Pompeius Magnus, himself a great patron of foreign men of letters'. Rhys Roberts went on to say: 'Indeed, if conjecture is to seek an author for the *De Sublimitate* in the age of Augustus this Pompeius might be named with far more plausibility than Dionysius himself'. But he did not follow up this hint, and in his last ideas in *Philological Quarterly* VII. 3 (1927) he sought a writer about 40 A.D.

However there is nothing improbable in a somewhat earlier date, indeed something very much in favour of it. In *Classical Review* XIII. 294 Robinson Ellis points out two parallels of the Περὶ Ὑψους with Manilius which cannot be accidental. They are: (1) XIII. 3 Herodotus, Stesichorus, Archilochus and above all Plato ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὅμηρικοῦ κείνου νόματος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὄσας παρατροπὰς ἀποχετευσάμενος. Manilius II. 8-10 cuiusque (Homeri) ex ore profusus | Omnis posteritas latices in carmina duxit, | Amnemque in tenues ausa est diducere riuos. (2) Περὶ Ὑψους XIII. 4. ἔστι δ' οὐ κλοπὴ τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν εἰδῶν ἢ πλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις. 'This proceeding is not plagiarism: it is like taking an impression from beautiful forms or figures or other works of art'.

Manilius II. 57-8 Nostra loquar, nulli uatum debebimus ora,
Nec furtum sed opus ueniet.

Like Professor Ellis, I have no doubt that the poet is the borrower, nor do I believe in a common source. The poet had read and utilized a recent work. He was himself writing between A.D. 9 and 14. There is nothing to show that Dionysius' Epistle to Pompey was written before the publication of his *Roman Antiquities* in B.C. 8. So the date of the Περὶ Ὑψους seems to lie between B.C. 8 and A.D. 14, and Pompeius seems to be entitled to its authorship, because (a) he is probably a Greek rhetorician of Rome; (b) his thoughts are exactly those of the treatise; (c) and the two fragments of his letter go far to show that his literary style was that of the Περὶ Ὑψους.

G. C. RICHARDS.

NOTES ON EURIPIDES' *IPHIGENIA IN TAURIS*.

My own previous impression that these¹ emendations had not been anticipated would now appear to derive confirmation from the absence of any reference to such readings in Mr Platnauer's newly published edition; for one of its main merits is the thoroughness with which it discusses textual problems on the basis of the existing critical literature. And such problems constitute after all the only really grave difficulty of this work (as of many another Greek poem) for any intelligent beginner not less than for the scholar and the specialist.

'Pl.' after a reference means that my suggestions may now be regarded as taking up the problem at the point where it has been left by Mr Platnauer's note, with which note I am in general, indeed not infrequently complete, agreement.

116-7] Pl. These two lines do not fit properly either here or in any of the various places hitherto suggested for them. And yet the remedy is simple. The existing connexion between 119 and 120 is not natural; 'let's go and hide' is too much of a *detail* to be followed at once by 'the god, at least, will not betray his own oracle'. 116-7 should follow 118-9. They fell out because the scribe's eye confused the *οὐ* under *ῥποι* with the *οὐ* two lines lower down; from the margin they were reinserted but at the wrong place.

183 *τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς*] *ἐν μ.* is feebly redundant with *ὑμνεῖ*. E. we know tends to redundancy; but this is still worse for following closely upon *ἐν θρήνοισιν* (and with a *τὰν* before each to emphasize the defect); and the lameness is trebled by the fact that *μολπαῖς* is less explicit than *θρήνοισιν*, a flaw felt by Köchly who reversed their order. Hartung deleted *τὰν ἐν μολπαῖς*, and Wecklein admits this conjecture to his app. crit.; before I knew of it I had conjectured *γὰς ἐν κόλποις*, deleting the preceding comma; *τὰν* in 182 will then be the relative, with *μοῦσ. νέκ. μελομένην* in apposition.

219] 'δυσχόρτους, pastureless, barren, is an odd epithet for *οἶκος*'—Pl. Yes, but so too is Köchly's *συχρόρτους*, which he recommends; and 'plains whose grass joins that of the city', *Andr.* 16 f., is hardly enough to justify 'houses whose grass joins that of the sea.' On the other hand 'pastureless, barren' was a wholly suitable epithet for the coast of the Euxine, and I feel that Köchly, Hartung (*δυσχαρίτους*), Rauchenstein (*δυσχάρτους*), and Plüss (*δυσείρτους*) are all barking up the wrong tree. For *οἶκος* I would read *ῶχθος*. It is not now doubted that *ῶχθος* and *ῶχθη* were interchangeable, and *ῶχθη* is used of the sea-coast at *Od.* ix 132, *Pind. Py.* i, 18. Cf. 253.

412] Pl. Perhaps simply *ἄξοντες*. *αὔξ-* due to association of ideas from *-πλουτ-*.

413] I do not doubt that Hartung was right to delete *βροτῶν*; but the duty remains of explaining how it got there. It can only have arisen as a gloss or supplement to some genitive; I therefore think that the line at one time ended *ἔστι τε πῆμα τῶν*, followed by a stop whether written or assumed. The result was *ἐπὶ* (for *ἔστι*, as often) *πημάτων βροτῶν*, whereupon *πημάτων* had of course to be 'corrected' to *πήμασιν*. What I read is *φίλα γὰρ ἐγένετ' ἐλπίς, ἔστι τε λημμάτων | ἀπληστος ἀνθρώποις*. This is the Greek for Housman's sense.

573 f.] I read *ἐν δὲ λέξεται μόνον* | *ἔτ'* (for the *ῶτ'* of codd.) *οὐκ ἄφρων ὦν κτλ.* For *λέξεται* cf. 1047. *ξ=τι*, and what looked like *λέπεται* was naturally taken for either *λείπεται* or *λυπείται*.

¹ That is, the bulk of them; I have included commentary.
three or four made as a result of reading Pl.'s

591-2. Pl.'s discussion is to the point—or points, for there are many—and helps to clear the ground; but no existing reconstruction is wholly satisfactory. Doubtless ἐγὼ would be easier than κάγω and φιλῶ than θέλω; but if you adopt them, you break twice in two successive words one of the fundamental principles of criticism. How came the easy and natural reading to be changed into the difficult and unnatural? and twice, too. If, on the other hand, a scribe is confronted with such a reading as οἱ κάγω θέλω, he may very well with the best intentions turn οἱ into οὐς. For various reasons, some of which I leave to be inferred, I propose σὺ δ'—εἰ γάρ, ὡς εἰκας, οὐ τι δυσμενής, | καὶ τὰς Μυκήνας οἰσθὰ γ'—οἱ κάγω θέλω, | σώθητι κείσε κτλ. Those last five words are germane to the very essence of the plot. What my γε balances is ὡς εἰκας. οὐ τι δυσμενής is a dramatic irony; and δυσγενής must in any case take all the wind from the next irony, 609-12, and, indeed, would prevent 609 from being the discovery which it obviously is. The situation is described as (*prima facie*) δυσμενής from the *other* side at 637. In οἱ κάγω θέλω Iph. permits herself an incidental reference to the *purport* (774) of the letter for the delivery of which she is now arranging.

633] Pl. I read ξανθὸν τ' ἔλαιον χόματος σπείσω κάτω. κάτω σπείσω by 'simplex ordo'. This gives τάφῳ . . . χόματος of a cenotaph; now cf. below, 702 f., χῶσον . . . τάφῳ also of a cenotaph (as Pl. points out).

819] ἐσθλός of course is nonsense. Read οἶδ'· οὐ γὰρ ὁ γάμος ἤλθ' ὅς ἂν μ' ἀφείλετο.

1055] Pl. Read τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἔγω σοί· πάντα συμβαίη καλῶς. The first half means 'I'll see to all else'; cf. 1049-51.

1386] I cannot myself see that any existing proposal is worth serious consideration except the one mentioned in Murray's apparatus. But F. G. Schmidt's δ γῆς Ἑλλάδος ναύτης λέως does not in my view come anywhere near accounting for that emphatic γῆς, the second word of the speech. (Even apart from that, it is not of course an applicable expression, because those addressed were no more than the sailors of a single ship; but you could pretend to get over that by the whole-for-part principle seen in e.g. *plebs eris*.) I think that the ναῦται of codd. was a miscorrection of ναυτῶν. Not only the sense, but the sentiment, required is given by δ γῆν Ἑλλάδος νοστήων λέως. Cf. 1399 f. For the construction cf. *Hel.* 891 γῆν τήνδε νοστήσας.

A. Y. CAMPBELL.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

THE SOURCES OF DIODORUS SICULUS XVI.

II.

THE SICILIAN NARRATIVE.

THE sources of the Sicilian narrative have been recently investigated by Barber¹ and Laqueur.² The former has suggested a comparison of Plutarch's Lives of Dion and Timoleon with the narrative of Diodorus as an avenue of approach to the problem; such a comparison will be applied later in order to check the conclusions reached by a survey of Diodorus' narrative. The latter has exploited the argument from detail, a method which has already been criticized in Article I (p. 79 f.).³ Space will not allow an examination of each point made by Laqueur; it must be left to the reader to judge between our investigations of the same problem.

I apply to the Sicilian narrative the same method as I have used in the rest of Diodorus XVI. It is apparent that this narrative falls into three groups, which concern the liberation of Syracuse by Dion, the first stage of Timoleon's career down to the expulsion of Dionysius II, and the later career of Timoleon down to his death; by examining the general characteristics of these groups it is possible to decide whether each group comes from one source and whether the groups do or do not proceed from different sources. When such general deductions have been made, points of detail in Diodorus and the scanty fragments of ancient historians are applied; and I have endeavoured to handle such arguments from detail with all caution. Finally, a comparison between Plutarch and Diodorus is used to check the general conclusions.

GROUP I.

In chapters 5-6, 9-13, and 16-20 a consecutive narrative is given for the years from 359/8 to 356/5, a period which culminates in the election of Dion as strategos autocrator at Syracuse. That this group is in itself a unity, drawn from one source by Diodorus, can be concluded from a consideration of the general tone and of the links of detail between the chapters.

The tyrant Dionysius II is treated with impartial moderation; the conclusion of peace with Carthage and Leucania and the foundation of colonies in the Adriatic are noted to his credit (5, 2-3); as compared with his father, he lacks enterprise (5, 1 *διὰ τὴν ἀπραγίαν εἰρηνικὸς καὶ πρὸς τὸν τρόπον*; 5, 4; 9, 3 *ἀνανδρία*). Of the tyrant's supporters Philustus (16, 3-4) and Nypsus (18, 1) are praised for loyalty, courage, or military ability. Of the liberators Dion is warmly commended for his brilliance and generosity (6, 1; 6, 3; 9, 3; 11, 2; 17, 5; 20, 2; 20, 6); but mention is also made of the suspicion with which Dion was regarded at Syracuse (17, 3) and of Dion's action in siding with the mercenaries against Syracuse (17, 4). Of Dion's supporters Heracleides is honourably mentioned (16, 2; 17, 3). So marked an impartiality in assessing the leading characters on both sides is the more remarkable when we consider the animosities involved in the struggle between tyranny and liberty. The only hint of a political bias in this group of narrative occurs in 17, 1, where the folly of the demos is ascribed to *ἄκαιροι δημηγόροι*.

Links of detail between the three sections into which Diodorus has divided the consecutive narrative are numerous; the two merchant vessels at 6, 5 are resumed

¹ *The Historian Ephorus*, Appendix I, p. 169 especially.

² P.W. s.v. *Timaios* 1150-1161.

³ *C.Q.* XXXI, no. 2, p. 79 f.

in 9, 2 and 9, 4, the Adriatic colonies at 5, 3 are resumed in 10, 2 as νεόκτιστοι, Megacles at 6, 4 and Heracleides at 6, 5 are resumed in 10, 3 and 16, 2, and Philistus at 11, 3 is resumed in 16, 1.

Finally, this group is characterized throughout by a wealth of detail and by an excited style. Figures of military and naval strength are frequent and precise, geographical and topographical detail is given, and chronology is defined to within a week (11, 3). The story is told in an almost melodramatic manner, events occurring 'paradoxically,' 'unexpectedly,' 'suddenly' (5, 4; 9, 1; 9, 3; 11, 1; 11, 5; 12, 2; 18, 3; 19, 1; 19, 2; 20, 4); there are a number of vivid details, such as the waggons carrying the armour (9, 5), the garlanded troops entering Syracuse (10, 5), the women cheering (11, 1), Dion wounded in the right arm (12, 4), the state-burial of the dead (13, 1), the violation of Philistus' corpse (16, 4), sacrifices to the gods (11, 1; 18, 5; 20, 5), the night attack by Nysius on the drunken Syracusans (19), the tears of the suppliants (20, 3), and the troops carrying plunder on their backs (20, 4). Examples of colourful writing occur throughout (e.g. 11, 1 f.; 12, 4; 13, 1). A minor characteristic of this group is the frequent mention of embassies or assemblies (some nine occurring in as many chapters); such mention implies a full source, which has been compressed by Diodorus into a purely factual statement.

We conclude, then, that the narrative for 359/8 to 356/5 is drawn from one source; that source is impartial in judging characters, betrays no political bias against tyranny but dislikes demagogues, has written a full account with much detail of personal names, geography, topography, and chronology, and has written that account in a highly coloured and vivid style.

GROUP 2.

In chapters 65 to 70 a consecutive narrative for the years 346/5 to 343/2 is given, beginning with the introduction of Timoleon and culminating in the final expulsion of Dionysius II and the restoration of constitutional government by Timoleon at Syracuse. Timoleon is eulogized throughout, Hicetas is mentioned without comment or censure, and Dionysius II is actuated by *ἀνανδρία* (70, 2). The narrative is clearly consecutive (e.g. 66, 7 resumed in 68, 4), with digressions to explain the choice of Timoleon and the situation in Sicily at the time of his arrival. There is abundance of detail, comprising military figures, names, and chronology to within three days (68, 4); and there are many exciting incidents, such as the stratagem practised by Timoleon on the Carthaginians, and picturesque details, such as Timophanes walking round the market-place (65, 3), Timoleon standing by the bema (68, 5), the march at the double on Syracuse (68, 11), and the departure of Dionysius II in a merchantman (70, 2). The excitement of the narrative moves Diodorus to a liberal use of 'unexpectedly' and 'paradoxically' (65, 5; 65, 8; 66, 3; 68, 10; 69, 3 and 5); and there are three embassies or assemblies recorded (65, 1; 66, 5; 68, 5).

This group, then, appears to derive from one source; and that source seems to be of the same fullness and of the same tone as that of Group 1. There are two points only in which Group 2 is distinguishable from Group 1; the omen attending Timoleon's voyage (66, 3) and the constitutional detail of Timoleon's settlement (70, 5) are not paralleled in Group 1; but both are special cases, which spring from the subject matter, and at the same time they are consonant with the mention of sacrifices to the gods and with the attention to detail which we noticed in Group 1.

GROUP 3.

The remainder of Timoleon's career is narrated in three sections: 72, 2-73 (sub 342/1), 77, 4-83 (sub 340/339 and 339/338), and 90, 1 (sub 337/6). Although there is a gap of one year between the first section and the second, it appears from the re-

sump
conseq
is also
second

T
the re
promp
before
to Tir
are af
intenc
figure
are no
treaty
ment
narrat
cenari
the la
rhetor
'unex
assem
3; 78

T
derive
career
tion in
style.

F
previo
Agath
(81, 3)
Agath
fates o
other
to that

T
we ha
each c
suppos
derives
found
points
story.

In
is said
incided
writing
Timole
which

¹ For
p. 79 f.
the posi

sumption of 73 fin. at 77, 4 that Diodorus intends the two sections to be read as a consecutive narrative. The last section, recording the death and burial of Timoleon, is also separated by an interval of one year; it contains no link of detail with the second section.

The central theme of this group is the liberation of Sicily from the tyrants and the repulse of the Carthaginians (summarized in 90, 1). The eulogy of Timoleon prompts some exaggerations which may be regarded with suspicion; for instance, before the Carthaginian invasion all the Sicilian states are represented as acceding to Timoleon (73, 2) and after the battle of the Crimisus river the Carthaginian forces are afraid to embark for Libya and the home government supposes that Timoleon intends to invade Africa (81, 2-3). The narrative contains many details of military figures and many names (e.g. 73, 2 fifteen traitors at Entella); financial resources are noted (73, 1; 73, 3; 78, 5; 81, 1; 81, 4; 83); the terms of the Carthaginian treaty with Timoleon are stated (82, 3), inscriptions in honour of Agathocles are mentioned (83, 2), and the decree in honour of Timoleon is quoted (90, 1). The narrative lacks dramatic colour except in two passages, the desertion of the mercenaries (78, 3 f.) and the description of the battle of the Crimisus river (79, 2 f.), the latter being introduced by the omen of the parsley and written in a highly rhetorical style; in these two passages Diodorus underlines the excitement by adding 'unexpectedly' and so forth (78, 3; 79, 5; 80, 1). In this Group embassies and assemblies are also noted, with a brief summary of the speeches delivered (73, 2 and 3; 78, 2; 79, 2; 81, 4; 82, 3).

The consistency of this group in tone and in detail suggests that it is a unity derived from one source, which gave a full account of the latter part of Timoleon's career. As compared with Groups 1 and 2, this Group lacks the quality of moderation in eulogy, the selection of vivid incidents, and the power of a sustained rhetorical style.

Further, this group has two features which may differentiate it from the two previous groups. Knowledge of subsequent events in Sicily is shown; thus in 83 Agathocles is mentioned, and the suggestion that Timoleon might invade Africa (81, 3) is most probably projected into the past by an author who had experienced Agathocles' invasion. Secondly, the intervention of divine justice is seen in the fates of Thrasius, the Carthaginians, and Agathocles (78, 3-4; 81, 2; 83, 2). On the other hand, the pious interpretation of the omen before the battle (79, 3 f.) is similar to that given of the omen which attended Timoleon's voyage to Sicily (66, 3 f.).

This general survey of the Sicilian narrative yields the tentative solution that we have three groups of consecutive narrative, each derived from one source. In each case the source was a full and detailed history. And there is some ground for supposing that Groups 1 and 2 derive from the same source and that Group 3 derives from a different source. Further support for this differentiation can be found in certain details in the narrative of Diodorus; but before arguing from points of detail, we must consider what contributions Diodorus has made to the story.

In the chapter which introduces Timoleon two errors are committed: Timoleon is said to have killed Timophanes (65, 4), and the trial of Timoleon to have coincided with the arrival of the Syracusan envoys (65, 7). In both cases Plutarch, writing at greater length and citing his sources, gives a different account (*Life of Timoleon*, 3-4); it is, then, probable that Diodorus rather than the full source from which he drew is responsible for these errors.¹ In 78, 4, where the sacrilege of

¹ For similar mistakes by Diodorus cf. Article I, by Plutarch and by Aristotle *Pol.* V 1306 a as a p. 79 f. In this case Diodorus is also vague about tyrant. the position of Timophanes, who is represented

Thrasius at Delphi is mentioned, Diodorus adds the words *καθάπερ μικρῷ πρότερον ἀνεγράψαμεν*; it is possible that Diodorus has placed here an excerpt drawn from Demophilus,¹ to whom we have ascribed the digression on the fates of the Phocian mercenary commanders (61 f.), but it is more probable that he found the incident recorded in the source which he was following for Sicilian history and then added a cross-reference to his earlier chapter (61 f.).² In 70, 4 Diodorus refers to the Roman period in which he was writing his history; and the three mentions of Agyrium may be prompted by Diodorus' affection for his birthplace (82, 4 and 5; 83, 3). In respect of content these are the only points which seem palpably to be due to Diodorus.

The interrelation of Groups 1 and 2 becomes clearer when we consider the introduction at 5, 4 (sub 359/8). The subject proposed as the central theme is the loss by Dionysius II 'through his own cowardice of the tyranny bound with bonds of steel'. This central theme is not concluded within the limits of Group 1, for at chapter 20 Nysius is still in control of the acropolis; it is only at the end of Group 2 (70, 2 sub 343/2) that Dionysius II is finally expelled and, in words which recall the introduction at 5, 4, 'lost through his own cowardice and lack of spirit the tyranny bound with bonds of steel'. It is, then, clear that this introduction was written for a narrative which contained as a central theme the tyranny of Dionysius II, culminating in his expulsion in 343/2.

But in 9, 1-3 (sub 357/6) a second introduction appears, expanding the announcement at 6, 1 that Dion liberated Syracuse and Sicily; this introduction is substantiated by Group 1 and reaches its climax in the liberation of Syracuse and heroization of Dion in chapter 20 (sub 356/5). It should, indeed, be noticed that at chapter 11, 2 (sub 357/6) the first entry of Dion into Syracuse is marked as ending the régime of a fifty years' tyranny; yet the following narrative makes it clear that the actual liberation is only accomplished in 356/5.

These two introductions can proceed either from the source or from Diodorus' own invention; if my arguments with reference to the Proem of book XVI have any force,³ it is more probable that the introductions are based directly upon the source employed in Group 1. In the special case of the first introduction it is difficult to believe that Diodorus wrote it out of his own head; for in point of fact he does not narrate the career of Dionysius II from 355/4 to 347/6.⁴ There is thus a strong presumption that the first introduction proceeds from the source followed in Group 1; this source, then, was introducing the history of Dionysius' fall from power, a period which culminated in 343/2; and, as we find that climax marked in Group 2 (70, 2), it is most probable that Groups 1 and 2 belong to one and the same source.

The differentiation of Groups 2 and 3 is supported by the repetition of Timoleon's legislation at Syracuse. In 70, 5 (sub 343/2) Timoleon embarked upon a recension of the laws (*τιθεὶς δημοκρατικούς νόμους καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν ιδιωτικῶν συμβολαίων δίκαια καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀκριβῶς διέταξε*); in 82, 6 (sub 339/8) Timoleon adapted the laws of Diocles (*καὶ τοὺς μὲν περὶ τῶν ιδιωτικῶν συμβολαίων ἢ κληρονομιῶν εἴασεν ἀμεταθέτους, τοὺς δὲ περὶ τῶν δημοσίων νενομοθετημένους πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ὥς ποτ' ἐδόκει συμφέρειν διώρθωσεν*). Now, since in the latter case Diodorus expressly says that the pre-existing laws (*τοὺς προϋπάρχοντας νόμους*) revised by Timoleon were those of

¹ Cf. Article I, p. 84.

² The death of Archidamus is recorded in the digression and again in the narrative (63, 1 and 88, 3), the citations deriving from different sources; but Diodorus fails to make a cross-reference.

³ Cf. Article I, p. 88.

⁴ The omission by Diodorus of the period 355/4 to 347/6 must be due not to a lack of sources but to his own choice; as in the case of the Sacred War, he may have considered part of the period too chaotic or too insignificant for his universal history.

Diocles, it is clear that we have here not a case of Timoleon revising his own earlier legislation but a repetition of one and the same act of legislation,¹ put by one source in 343/2 and by the other in 339/8; it follows, then, that Groups 2 and 3, if each is a unity, proceed from different sources.

Identification of the Source for Groups 1 and 2.

Histories of Sicilian affairs on the scale which we have seen to be necessary for these groups were composed by Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus; as they are all mentioned in the bibliographical citations made by Diodorus, and as they were subsequently quoted by Plutarch, these three have first claim for consideration.

Ephorus treated of Sicilian affairs in books XXVIII and XXIX. The contents of book XXVIII are held by Barber² to have covered the second half of Dionysius I's tyranny, commencing from the year 392 B.C.; the contents of book XXIX are held by Barber³ to have reached 344 B.C., by Laqueur⁴ to have gone beyond 356 B.C., and by Schwartz⁵ to have stopped at 356 B.C. The evidence hitherto applied to this problem is inconclusive; for, assuming Ephorus XXIX to have been a finished book (argued in Article I, p. 86), the central theme could be either the tyranny until Dion's liberation of Syracuse in 356 B.C. or the whole period until Dionysius resigned his power to Timoleon in 344/3; and, while the datable fragments assigned to XXIX (J. 70 F 89 and 219) refer to the years 358/7 and 356 B.C., the fragment F 221 concerning the name of one of Timoleon's supporters in the assassination of Timophanes can be referred either to 366 B.C. or to 345 B.C., the earlier date being the more probable, as such a detail would be most naturally given at the first mention of Timophanes' death in the history of Greece Proper, i.e. in an earlier book than XXIX.

The problem is decisively solved by Diodorus 14, 3: Diyllus of Athens beginning his first Syntaxis from 357/6 included Greek and Sicilian affairs down to 341/0. Diyllus was continuing the work of Ephorus; therefore Ephorus XXIX must have ended not at 344/3 but at 357/6.⁶

If our argument that Groups 1 and 2 derive from one source is admitted, then that source cannot be Ephorus; and the hypothesis that the source may be Ephorus to 357/6 and then his continuator Diyllus is untenable because Diyllus as stylist and historian has little in common with Ephorus (cf. Article I, p. 90). If, however, our argument for assigning both groups to one source seems too tentative, we must consider whether Ephorus has a claim to be regarded as the source for Group 1, which covers the years 359/8 to 356/5.

Of the Sicilian fragments (F 89-92 and 218-221) none can be employed against the claim of Ephorus; two have sometimes been used to support him. F 219 states that Ephorus described the end of Philistus as suicide whereas Timonides wrote of him as captured alive; the only certain deduction⁷ from this fragment is that Timonides was not the source employed by Diodorus 16, 3; Ephorus may have been the source but equally so Theopompus or Timaeus, whose views on this matter are unknown. F 220 states that Timaeus blasphemed against Philistus, whereas Ephorus eulogized him; here too the safe deduction is that Timaeus cannot be the source behind Diodorus 16, 3-4; Ephorus may have been but equally so may Theopompus.

¹ Whether Timoleon did in fact legislate twice does not affect my argument that in Diodorus both accounts summarize the legislation of Timoleon and that the second account mentioning Diocles' laws does not issue from the same source as the first account.

² G. L. Barber, *The Historian Ephorus*, p. 45.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 46.

⁴ *Hermes* XLVI, p. 335.

⁵ P.-W. s.v. *Diodoros* 681; s.v. *Ephoros* 10.

⁶ Cf. Article I, p. 86.

⁷ Volquardsen, *Untersuch. Diod.* XI-XVI, p. 102, deduces that Timaeus was the source; Laqueur in P.-W. s.v. *Timaios* 1153 deduces that Ephorus was the source. Both deductions are equally arbitrary.

But, if the argument from the fragments of Ephorus is inconclusive, a consideration of the style and of the choice of vivid incidents, which we noted to be characteristic of Group 1, leads to the exclusion of Ephorus. For the narrative of Ephorus was reputed to be lacking in excitement (J. 70 T 28); and those sections of Diodorus XVI which in my opinion derive from Ephorus¹ reveal a dullness which confirms his reputation.

Timaeus also may be rejected on general grounds. For the impartiality towards the tyrant and the tyrant's party, which is characteristic of Groups 1 and 2, is incompatible with the censorious abominator of tyranny; and the lack of attention paid to the connections of Dion with philosophy supplies another general argument against Timaeus. In support of this exclusion we have already noticed the fragment which represents Timaeus blaspheming against Philistus (J. 70 F 220); from this the safe deduction can be drawn that Timaeus was not the source behind Diodorus 16, 3-4. One other fragment, in which Timaeus censures Theopompus for despatching Dionysius II in a merchantman (J. 115 F 341), has been used to indicate both that Timaeus is and that Timaeus is not the source of Diodorus 70, 3; Volquardsen² argues that Diodorus found this attack on Theopompus in Timaeus and adopted the phrase of Theopompus, while Laqueur³ is content to assume that the same phrase in Diodorus and in Theopompus means that Diodorus was using Theopompus. It is thus clear that from this fragment no safe deduction can be drawn by either side.

We are left with Theopompus as a possible candidate. A strong presumption in his favour is provided by 71, 3, where Diodorus states that Theopompus included in his *Philippica* an excursus of three books on Sicilian affairs which culminated in the expulsion of Dionysius II. This excursus terminates at the same point as the source of Groups 1 and 2; and Diodorus in making this statement under the year 343/2, in which the expulsion of Dionysius II is set, inserts it at the precise point at which his source for Group 2 came to an end. Now in giving this information Diodorus has departed from his general practice; for his habit is to cite from his bibliographical source a summary outline of a history's scope,⁴ whereas here he supplies details of part of a work. This anomaly can best be explained by the hypothesis that Diodorus had just been excerpting from Theopompus' excursus; upon coming to the end of it (70, 6) he added this sentence at 71, 3 before turning to a new source (72, 2).

In 71, 3 there are two minor difficulties. In the first place, the book-numbers given by Diodorus as XLI-XLIII should probably be altered to XXXIX-XLI;⁵ this error, whether it be due to the source of Diodorus (if he had one) or to Diodorus himself or to his scribes, does not invalidate the deductions we have already made. In the second place, Diodorus states that this excursus covered a period of fifty years. The date which marks the end of the excursus is fixed by the narrative and by the chronological system of Diodorus to 343/2; therefore the excursus must, according to Diodorus, have commenced at the year 392/1. Jacoby (IId, p. 383), assuming Diodorus to mean that the excursus started from the institution of the tyranny at Syracuse, points out that Diodorus has committed an error; for all traditional dates for the institution of Dionysius I's tyranny antedate 392/1 by at least ten years. Let us first consider the question why Theopompus chose the year 392/1 for the beginning of his excursus XXXIX-XLI. The answer becomes clear, if we take into account the *Hellenica* and *Philippica* of Theopompus. Of these the former covered

¹ Cf. Article I, p. 85 f.

² *Op. cit.* p. 101.

³ P.-W. s.v. *Timaios* 1156.

⁴ E.g. XIV 46, 6; 84, 7; XV 37, 3; 60, 6; 89, 3; 94, 4; 95, 4; XVI 3, 8; 14, 3; 76, 5.

⁵ J. IId, p. 383, gives the reasons for changing the numbers from those given by D. and also advances a probable explanation of D.'s mistake; cf. Laqueur in P.-W. s.v. *Theopompus* 2217.

the se
twenty
imple
dealt
his ex
the ye
excurs
compa
being
positi
then, t
XXXI
the ph
ambig

Th
the so
coincid
probab
been e

F
what v
wrote
acters
ability
gogy.³
as 19-2
the col
general
positio
been g
include
omen m

Th
the fra
fragmen
πλοῖον
reflecti
this fra
not the

In
have le
been bo
argume

¹ Cf. F
of the ye
in the his

² In 11
mark the
cuse; bu
to 71, 3
define th
passage
beginning
406/5; th

the seventeen years from 411/410 down to 395/4 (Diod. XIII 42, 5 and 84, 7); of the twenty or so fragments which survive, none refers to Sicily but the title of the history implies a treatment of the western Greek world; if, then, Theopompus had already dealt with Sicilian affairs 411-394 B.C. in his *Hellenica*, it would be natural to begin his excursus in the *Philippica* from a date after 394 B.C. The *Philippica* began under the year 360/359 (Diod. XVI 3, 8). The motive for including in the *Philippica* an excursus on the earlier tyranny in Sicily may reasonably be held to arise from a comparison of the Sicilian with the Macedonian empire; and that empire came into being not in the fifth century but in the year 392/1, when Carthage recognized the position of Dionysius I in Sicily (Diod. XIV 96, 4 and 100, 1).¹ We may conclude, then, that Diodorus' statement in 71, 3 means that Theopompus in his *Philippica* XXXIX-XLI covered the Sicilian period of fifty years from 392/1 down to 343/2; the phrase ἀρχάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Διονυσίου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τυραννίδος admits of an ambiguity which is removed by applying the datum of fifty years.²

Thus Diodorus XVI 71, 3 supplies two arguments in favour of Theopompus as the source used for Groups 1 and 2. The termination of Theopompus' excursus coincides with the termination of the source for Groups 1 and 2; and the most probable reason for Diodorus' reference to Theopompus' excursus is that he had been excerpting Theopompus up to that point.

Further, the general characteristics which we noticed in Groups 1 and 2 fit what we know of Theopompus' style and selection of incidents; for Theopompus wrote with vivid detail and with an eye to πάθος. Again in judging leading characters he appears to have reserved his censure for their private lives, to have praised ability, to have admired autocracy, and to have found grounds for censuring demagogues.³ On general grounds Theopompus is a strong candidate; and such passages as 19-20, describing the drunkenness in Syracuse and the raid of Nysius, excel in the colour which we expect of the author who needed the bridle. Against these general characteristics one point, which we noticed in Group 2, may be set in opposition: the omen attendant upon the voyage of Timoleon to Sicily (66, 3) has been greeted by Barber⁴ as deriving from Timaeus. But, as Theopompus also included omens in his Sicilian history (cf. Plutarch, *Life of Dion* 24), this particular omen may equally well derive from Theopompus.

These general arguments must stand by themselves. Of the Sicilian excursus the fragments (J. 115, F 185-198) are indecisive. We have already seen that the fragment F 341 shows that Diodorus 70, 3 in employing the words ἐν μικρῇ στραγγύλῃ πλοίῳ reflects Theopompus' words νηὶ στραγγύλῃ; but, as it has been argued that the reflection may come through the medium of Timaeus, no weight can be attached to this fragment as indicating either that Theopompus was or that Theopompus was not the source for Group 2.

In summary of this part of the paper, one may notice that the grounds which have led to the identification of Theopompus as the source for Groups 1 and 2 have been both positive and negative. Most weight should be attached to the general arguments, which are positively in favour of Theopompus—the attitude towards

¹ Cf. Barber, *op. cit.* p. 45, for the significance of the year 392 B.C. as marking a dividing point in the history of Dionysius I.

² In 11, 2 D. uses the period of fifty years to mark the period of tyranny exercised in Syracuse; but I do not think this bears any relation to 71, 3 where the period of fifty years is used to define the scope of Theopompus' work. The passage in 11, 3 is given under 357/6, i.e. the beginning of Dionysius I's tyranny is dated to 406/5; this year we know to have been adopted

by Philistus, Timaeus, and Dionys. Hal., whereas Ephorus began the tyranny from 408/7 (cf. J. II d, p. 383). It is not known what date was adopted by Theopompus. If any conclusion as to source may be based on D. 11, 2, it can only be the negative one that Ephorus is not eligible.

³ Cf. especially J. 115, F 27; T 19 and 20; F 100.

⁴ *Op. cit.* p. 169.

the leading characters, the style and the manner of narration, the general unity of Groups 1 and 2, the coincidence of the end of Group 2 with the end of Theopompus' excursus on Sicily, and the hypothesis suggested to explain why Diodorus (71, 3) mentioned the excursus of Theopompus. The negative arguments have enabled us to exclude Timaeus with certainty as a source for either Group; and it is at least probable that Ephorus is not the source for Group 1, with the dimensions of which Ephorus XXIX coincides. These two negative conclusions become arguments in favour of Theopompus if the possible sources for these two Groups are limited to Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus. The only possible rivals are Diyllus, who has already been excluded on the grounds of briefness and scandalmongering; Callisthenes, whose *Hellenica* 387/6-357/6 contains no Sicilian fragments and is never quoted in Plutarch's Lives of Dion and Timoleon; Athanis, who wrote a summary history (Diod. XV 94, 4 *ἐν κεφαλαιοῖς*) of the period 362/1 to 357/6 and continued to an unknown date but is represented only by four fragments;¹ and Timonides, whose letters are twice quoted by Plutarch (*Dion* 31 and 35) but cannot be seriously advanced as a full history of the period.² It is, then, highly unlikely that any of these writers either wrote a full history such as we have seen must be the source of these two Groups or survived in bulk at the time when Diodorus was writing. On cumulative grounds the conclusion that Theopompus' *Philippica* is the source may be strongly pressed.

The scope of this paper does not allow of a full discussion of the source followed by Diodorus in the few excerpts which he devotes to Sicilian history in XV. The summary contained in Barber³ is therefore assumed as indicating the general lines of the problem. Whereas Timaeus is generally admitted to be the source used throughout XIII and XIV, the variant accounts of Dionysius' reception at Olympia (XIV 109 and XV 7, the years being given as 388/7 and 386/5) postulate a change of source early in XV; and, as Barber rightly stresses, there is no evidence in favour of Ephorus as the new source used for the bulk of XV, either in respect of such details as the cause of the exile of Philistus or in the general type of incident narrated (e.g. XV 6 f. and 74). Now, although Diodorus has supplied only spasmodic pieces of Sicilian narrative, the excerpts themselves are full and represent a detailed source (e.g. XV 13 f.); and the excerpts (e.g. XV 6, 2 and XV 74, 2) also reflect a source interested in the private lives of the great and apt to mention bibulousness. The fullness of the source excludes all writers except Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus; and, as Timaeus and Ephorus are already excluded on other grounds, Theopompus appears as the probable source for the latter half of Dionysius I's reign, a probability strengthened by our memory of Theopompus' strictures on Philip and on the sons of Dionysius. Thus on independent grounds it appears probable that Theopompus was the source used in Diodorus XV; if so, then it is probable that the same source was used in XVI.

Identification of the Source for Group 3.

As we have shown that Ephorus XXIX ended at 356 B.C. and Theopompus' excursus on Sicily ended at 343/2, neither can be a candidate for Group 3, which covers the period 342/1 to 337/6. As Group 3 derives from a detailed and full source, Timaeus is the obvious probability; and the special characteristics which we noted in Group 3 fit him well—the knowledge of events as late as the time of Agathocles and Hiero, interest in local buildings, citation of an inscription at Syracuse, the tendency to eulogize beyond the bounds of historical truth, the sense of divine intervention, and the style marked by a love of the purple patch. On

¹ Mueller, *F.H.G.* II, pp. 81-83; cf. Schwartz in *P.-W.* s.v. *Athanis*, 1939.

² *F.H.G.* II, pp. 83-84; it is probable that

Plutarch is not citing Timonides at first hand but found him cited in his source.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 168 f.

these g
this con
Timoleon

COM

Our
Theopom
of Dion.
Plutarch
35, 36, a
frequen
than an
source o
If, then,
find som
also used

The
(e.g. P. 2
P. 25: I
(by Dion
associate
(400 ship
P. 7 and
These p
Diodorus

The
Plutarch
at 6, 3 and
and D. 1
P. 32: D
Dionysius
military
duration
crepancie
common
not respo
Plutarch.

Thur
of the na
identifica

The
same peri
for Group
parison of

In na
gives a co

¹ The sur
is similar to
for the eul
and 143.

² Wheth

these general grounds¹ we may conclude Timaeus to be the source of Group 3; this conclusion will be fortified by our study of Plutarch's sources in the *Life of Timoleon*.

COMPARISON OF PLUTARCH'S 'LIFE OF DION' AND 'LIFE OF TIMOLEON'
WITH THE NARRATIVE OF DIODORUS.

Our conclusion that Diodorus was using in Group 1 one source, namely Theopompus, can be checked to some extent by a comparison with Plutarch's *Life of Dion*. For one of Plutarch's sources² is Theopompus (cited in *Dion* 24); but Plutarch also cites Ephorus, Timaeus, Timonides, and Plato (*Dion*, e.g. 6, 11, 14, 20, 35, 36, and 54), and cites them more frequently than he does Theopompus. The frequency of citation, however, does not reflect a greater or less use of one source than another, for it can be argued either that one cites variants from the main source or that one cites exceptions to the general consensus of a number of sources. If, then, Diodorus consistently used one of Plutarch's sources, we shall expect to find some points of similarity in detail between their accounts; secondly, as Plutarch also used other sources, we shall expect to find discrepancies.

The points of similarity lie mainly in the sequence of a number of incidents (e.g. P. 26-27: D. 9, 5) and in such details as military figures (the two merchantmen P. 25: D. 6, 5, and 9, 2 and 4), chronology (seven days P. 29: D. 11, 3), negotiations (by Dionysius II P. 30: D. 11, 4), and the estimate of the power of the tyranny, associated with the phrase 'bound with bonds of steel' and the stock paradox (400 ships, 10,000 cavalry, and a large host of infantry; P. 14: D. 9, 2 and 70, 2; P. 7 and 10 for 'bonds of steel' and D. 5 and 70, 2; the paradox in P. 50 and in D. 9, 1). These points of similarity are sufficiently striking to support our argument that Diodorus and Plutarch have a source in common.

The points of discrepancy are numerous. In general approach the account in Plutarch is strongly influenced by the philosophical tradition (in D. only mentioned at 6, 3 and 20, 2); the treatment of Dion is considerably more eulogistic (cf. P. 38-39 and D. 16, 3-4) and Heracleides is throughout judged from a different angle (cf. P. 32: D. 6, 5 and 16, 2). In detail there are frequent differences; for example, Dionysius II's treatment of Dion (cf. P. 14 and D. 6, 4 *συνλαβὼν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ*), military figures (P. 22 and 25: D. 9, 6; P. 27: D. 9, 6; P. 32: D. 16, 2), and the duration of the tyranny (P. 28 as 42 years: D. 11, 2 as 50 years). These discrepancies show that the sources conflated by Plutarch at these points are not common to Diodorus; and that, if Diodorus used one source only, that source was not responsible for the attitude towards leading characters which is revealed in Plutarch.

Thus the consideration of the sources of the *Life of Dion* and the comparison of the narratives of Diodorus and Plutarch lead to a conclusion which fits our identification of Theopompus as the source of Diodorus for Group 1.

The *Life of Timoleon* 1-22, 3 covers the same period as Group 2 and 22, 4 f. the same period as Group 3; in testing our conclusion that Diodorus used Theopompus for Group 2 and Timaeus for Group 3, it is convenient to make a separate comparison of Plutarch 1-22, 3 with Diodorus 65-70.

In narrating the story of Timophanes the biographer is detailed, while Diodorus gives a compendious account; it has been suggested above that in two points where

¹ The summary of Timoleon's speech at 79, 2 is similar to Timaeus frag. 134 (Mueller *F.H.G.* I); for the eulogy of Timoleon cf. Timaeus frag. 97 and 143.

² Whether Plutarch was collating these sources

himself or was using a Hellenistic biographer who had collated them is immaterial to my argument. I have therefore felt it unnecessary to qualify mention of Plutarch's sources by such a phrase as 'or ultimate sources'.

Diodorus and Plutarch differ the fault seems to lie in the carelessness of Diodorus.¹ If so, these discrepancies do not imply that Diodorus was following a different source from that used by Plutarch. On the other hand, the epigrammatic phrase with which both Diodorus (65, 8) and Plutarch (7, 2) close this episode suggests that at this place both were using the same source.

The points of similarity are salient. The dream of the priestesses of the Maid, the naming of the trireme, the omen of the torch and its interpretation are so identical in detail that they must derive from the same source (D. 66, 3-5; P. 8); the numbers of ships and of men are often the same in both accounts (e.g. D. 66, 2; P. 8, 4; D. 68, 5; P. 9, 1; D. 68, 9; P. 11, 5; D. 68, 10; P. 12, 8); and the description of the stratagem at Rhegium is probably derived from a common source (D. 68, 4-8; P. 9-10; with such details in common as the mention of the bema). There are a number of discrepancies which do not necessarily argue the use of different sources; thus the incidents which preceded Timoleon's arrival in Sicily are differently arranged and each author narrates some incidents which are not narrated by the other; but this difference may be explained by the difference of method with which Plutarch and Diodorus marshalled their material. In the same way the importance attached to the actions of Hicetas serves in Plutarch as a foil to the character of Timoleon; Diodorus is only concerned with a summary of the historical situation.

But in describing the stages by which Timoleon entered Syracuse and made a pact with Dionysius, and in relating the intervention of the Carthaginian forces to the position of Timoleon, Diodorus and Plutarch differ widely (D. 68, 11-70, 1; P. 13 and 16 f.); this difference concerns so large and so important a part of the narrative that we must conclude that it is due to a difference of sources.

It would appear, then, that Plutarch is using at least two sources, only one of which is common to Diodorus. The sources cited by Plutarch in this part of the *Life of Timoleon* are Ephorus, Theopompus, and Timaeus (4, 6); and, if our argument is valid that Ephorus did not narrate the career of Timoleon (the citation in Plutarch deriving from an earlier book of Ephorus dealing with the mainland), then we know definitely of only two sources used by Plutarch, namely Theopompus and Timaeus. Thus either Theopompus or Timaeus may be the source common to Plutarch and to Diodorus. Our identification of Theopompus as the source of Group 2 in Diodorus is thus consistent with the conclusion drawn from a comparison of Diodorus and Plutarch; for the common source may be Theopompus.²

¹ D. and P. also differ in the name they give to the father of Timoleon; it seems more probable that one of them has made a slip than that each followed a different source.

² In the text I have simplified the complex question of Plutarch's sources in the *Timoleon* by assuming that his material derives from Theopompus and Timaeus, whether immediately or through an intermediate source. It has, however, been maintained that P. used only one source, Timaeus; if that is so, it would at first sight appear that the source common to D. and P. is Timaeus and that, as P. used only one source, D. must have imported a second source, namely Theopompus. But the theory that P. used only Timaeus postulates the use by Timaeus of Theopompus (to explain the citation in *Timoleon* 4, 6); thus the ultimate sources of P.'s material are still Theopompus and Timaeus. The element common to D. and P. can then be ascribed to the fact that D. is using Theo-

pompus directly and P. is using Theopompus indirectly, i.e. through the medium of Timaeus; the discrepancies between D. and P. can be attributed to the departure of Timaeus from the account of Theopompus, a departure reflected in P. following Timaeus. And this deduction is compatible with our identification of Theopompus as the source of Group 2 in D. The latest contribution to the problem of P.'s sources is a lucid article by H. D. Westlake (*The Sources of Plutarch's Timoleon*: C.Q. XXXII, no. 2, April, 1938), who concludes that P. followed a Peripatetic biography of Timoleon itself based on Timaeus and supplemented it by a direct use of Timaeus; if his conclusion is valid, as I think it is, then again, as Timaeus used Theopompus, we can ascribe the points of similarity between D. and P. to Theopompus, used directly by D. and intermediately through both his sources by P. and the points of discrepancy between D. and P. to the divergence of Timaeus from Theopompus.

In C
is descri
and 77,
the sam
of the C
for the s
sometim
to which
river is
(P. 27),
spoil are
narrative
the term
(D. 90, 1
P. 30, 5
represent
plained a
P. 30, 3;
From

used the
ally accep
Life, the

Ther
the deser
6,000 faci
served in
Sacred W
in descri
their nur
employed
Here we
mitted by
different
have plac
concernin

ascription
Final
the buildi
stitutional
constitutio
tion, the
Timaeus
constitutio
mentions
not under

³ Westlak
scriptions
p. 66, howe
the depositi
battle (P. 24
passage in I
his mercena
that D. and

In Group 3 the action taken against the tyrants before the Carthaginian invasion is described with greater detail than in Plutarch (e.g. Hicetas in P. 24, 1: D. 72 and 77, 5); but the common incidents are described in the same manner and with the same motivation (e.g. in the sending of Leptines to Greece and in the invasion of the Carthaginian territory). The figures for the Greek and Carthaginian forces, for the spoil taken, and for the number of settlers are the same in both writers (D. sometimes giving more detail e.g. 82, 3 and 82, 5), with the exception of one passage to which I shall return (P. 25: D. 78, 2). The account of the battle of the Crimisis river is abbreviated in Diodorus, who omits the manoeuvres of the Greek cavalry (P. 27), but the omen of the parsley, the effects of the storm, and the record of the spoil are so identical that both accounts must derive from the same source.¹ The narratives after the defeat of the Carthaginians show the same community of source; the terms of the peace (D. 82, 3: P. 34, 2) and the decree in honour of Timoleon (D. 90, 1: P. 39, 5), the employment of Greek mercenaries by Carthage (D. 82, 4: P. 30, 5) and the execution of Hicetas (D. 82, 4: P. 32, 2), these may serve as representative examples. Such differences as occur in point of detail may be explained as due to compendium in one or the other (e.g. the Bruttians D. 82, 2: P. 30, 3; and the examples given of tyrants D. 82, 4 and P. 34).

From this comparison the conclusion must be drawn that Diodorus and Plutarch used the same source; as Plutarch cites Timaeus (36, 2),² and as Timaeus is generally accepted as the source (directly or indirectly) of Plutarch for this part of the Life, the identification of Timaeus as the source for Group 3 receives support.

There is, however, one discrepancy to be considered. Plutarch in describing the desertion of 1,000 mercenaries on the eve of the battle (25) gives the total left at 6,000 facing 70,000 and does not identify the deserters with the mercenaries who had served in the Sacred War; he does, however, identify with those who had served in the Sacred War two other forces of mercenaries (30, 7). Diodorus, on the other hand, in describing the same event (78, 2 f.), gives the total at 12,000 facing six times their number (viz. 70,000, cf. 77, 4) and identifies the 1,000 deserters as those employed in the Sacred War, adding the name of their commander Thrasius. Here we may have two mistakes, in point of number and in identification, committed by Diodorus or by Plutarch³; alternatively, Diodorus may have had a different source and, if so, as he remarks *καθ' ὅσον μικρὸν πρότερον ἀνεγράψαμεν*, he may have placed here an excerpt from Demophilus (cf. Article I, p. 85, on the excursus concerning the fate of the Phocian commanders). Whichever view is adopted, our ascription of Timaeus as the source for Group 3 generally is not disturbed.

Finally, Plutarch does not enter into constitutional detail and does not record the buildings in Sicily; this may well be due to his own lack of interest in constitutional detail and in local colour. Diodorus twice gives detail of Timoleon's constitutional reform at Syracuse, a repetition as we have seen of the same legislation, the former instance being ascribed to Theopompus as source, the latter to Timaeus (D. 70, 5 and 82, 6-7). Plutarch (24, 3) mentions the revision of the constitution at a point of time nearer to the first instance in Diodorus and he also mentions the name Cephalus which occurs in Diodorus' second instance. This does not undermine the conclusions drawn above from the repetition in Diodorus, but it

¹ Westlake, *loc. cit.* p. 72 notes that the descriptions are in substantial agreement. On p. 66, however, he finds discrepancy between the deposition of Hicetas before the Crimisis battle (P. 24, 1) and D. 72, 2-4; but the parallel passage in D. is 77, 5, where Hicetas surrendered his mercenaries to Timoleon. It appears rather that D. and P. both writing compendiously have

stressed different aspects of a surrender by Hicetas; the discrepancy therefore is not such as to argue a change of source.

² In *Moralia*, p. 676d, Plutarch in mentioning the omen of the parsley cites Timaeus as his authority.

³ Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers*, p. 173, n. 4, considers Plutarch to have erred.

does invite some conjectural explanation. The most plausible one is that Diodorus excerpted his first instance from Theopompus; on turning to Timaeus he found another account of the same revision at a slightly later point of time and omitted it, but later in his second instance included the detail of Cephalus deriving from Timaeus; the positioning of the second instance (82, 6-7) may be due to a summary in Timaeus of Timoleon's final settlement, of which a hint is given by Plutarch (35).

In summary of the results yielded by this section, which is in the nature of the material highly conjectural, it should be emphasized that its primary purpose is to show that the conclusions reached in the identification of Diodorus' sources are not open to disproof by reference to Plutarch. This has, I think, been demonstrated. At the same time, the comparison of the two accounts of Timoleon has yielded some deductions which lend positive support to our conclusions. In Group 3, which comprises the later career of Timoleon, we had concluded that the source is Timaeus; the account given by Plutarch for the same period of Timoleon's career is found to be in such close agreement with that of Group 3 that both must derive from the same source; in the case of Plutarch it can be confidently asserted that his source was Timaeus, possibly used together with a biography itself based on Timaeus. In Group 2, which comprises the earlier career of Timoleon, we had concluded that the source is Theopompus; the corresponding narrative of Plutarch contains not only points of agreement, which postulate a common source, but also important points of disagreement, which postulate a difference of sources. It is most probable that Plutarch derived his account of Timoleon's early career also from Timaeus, whether directly or indirectly; it follows then that, if Diodorus used only one source, that source was not Timaeus but at the same time was a source who had much in common with Timaeus. This supports our conclusions about Group 2. For on internal evidence it is clear that Diodorus changed his source between Groups 2 and 3; thus, if his source for Group 3 was Timaeus, his source for Group 2 cannot be Timaeus. Secondly, the comparison with Plutarch shows that the source for Group 2 had much in common with Timaeus; and, as Timaeus drew upon Theopompus for the early career of Timoleon, there is good reason to deduce that the source of Group 2 is Theopompus. This deduction gives independent support to our earlier conclusion that Theopompus is the source employed for Group 2.

Two isolated chapters in Diodorus deal with western affairs. At 7, 1 the foundation of Tauromenium by the father of Timaeus is recorded in a short section which contains a reference by Diodorus to his own contemporary times; this may derive from Diodorus' general knowledge eking out a mention in his text-book¹ or it may derive from Timaeus; in the latter case Diodorus when excerpting Timaeus must have placed the excerpt under its appropriate year, thus divorcing it from the Sicilian narrative taken from Timaeus. At 15 the foundation of the Bruttian state is described briefly; as it comes next to an excerpt from Theopompus and as it contains mention of slaves and derivation of the name from the local dialect, the passage may be tentatively ascribed to Theopompus.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS.

In this paper an attempt has been made to shift the centre of gravity in the source-criticism of Diodorus from argumentation based on detail to an analysis of the general tendencies and chronological proportions of such groups of consecutive narrative as emerge from this exceptionally uneven book of Diodorus. This change of approach to the problem yields results which are widely different from those, for

¹ Cf. Article I, p. 91.

instance
authori
of how

WI
his sou
the con
of one
history
as the v
356 B.C.
continua
Sacred
remaini
fitted o
having
continue
Diodoru

In a
the auth
and deri
choice v
affairs;
the book
did Diod
rather co

The
As a m
colour to
or adjust
been pos
analyse
history s
Diodorus
or carele
addition
proceed
his chron
obscured
incident.

Thu
Proem o
then exc

¹ That
period 341
meaning o
της Φιλίππου
who is po
Jacoby (73
XVIII 173
to the wh
equates th
sander; bu
terpretatio
316/5 is nu

instance, of Momigliano and Laqueur; and the difference affects not only the ultimate authority for historical data transmitted through Diodorus but also the conception of how Diodorus composed his history.

Whereas Momigliano and Laqueur concluded that Diodorus on occasion changed his sources several times within one chapter or systematically conflated two sources, the conclusion suggested in this paper is that Diodorus made consecutive excerpts of one source at a time. Thus, having used Ephorus for the Greek and Persian history of his books XI-XV, Diodorus began his book XVI by excerpting Ephorus; as the work of Ephorus' own hand failed, i.e. Ephorus XXVII for Greek affairs in 356 B.C. and Ephorus XXVI for Persian affairs in 341/0, he proceeded with the continuation of the History of Ephorus, i.e. Ephorus XXX (Demophilus) for the Sacred War to 346/5 and Diyllus Syntaxis I for Greek affairs to 341/0; for the remaining years of his book, 340/339 to 336/5, he used Diyllus Syntaxis II,¹ which fitted on to the termination of Ephorus' History. In Sicilian affairs Diodorus, having used Theopompus' Sicilian excursus in the *Philippica* for his book XV, continued to excerpt him for XVI; when the work of Theopompus ended in 343/2, Diodorus turned to Timaeus, of whom he had made use in earlier books.

In other words, Diodorus employed a simple method of composition: he chose the author whom he considered to be the best standard author of convenient scale and derived his own narrative from that one source. In the case of book XVI his choice was Ephorus for Greek and Persian affairs and Theopompus for Sicilian affairs; owing to the accident that each of these authors failed him in the course of the book, he turned to Diyllus and to Timaeus. In no case, so far as we can see, did Diodorus compare, conflate, or make parallel excerpts from two sources; he was rather content to rely entirely upon his best standard author.

The simplicity of the method argues little originality of intellect in Diodorus. As a medium of transmission, he lends neither historical causation nor political colour to the source whom he employs; and he makes little effort to fill up the gaps or adjust the excerpts derived from one source to those of another. Thus it has been possible to trace the dimensions of the sources employed by Diodorus and to analyse the general characteristics of those sources; in a compiler of universal history such transparency is almost tantamount to virtue. But in other respects Diodorus has been at fault. We have noticed numerous mistakes, due to ignorance or carelessness and aggravated by the compendious nature of his excerpts; in addition to this, he has been content on occasions when his full source ended to proceed with a text-book of the most meagre proportions; in fitting his narrative to his chronological scheme, itself derived from a chronological table, he has often obscured the exact chronology by bunching his narrative around one salient dated incident.²

Thus we may picture Diodorus at work on a cross-section of book XVI. The Proem of Ephorus XXVII he adapted to form the Proem of his own book, and he then excerpted Ephorus XXVII for the early stages of Philip's career; this excerpt

¹ That Diyllus Syntaxis II comprised the period 341/0 to 336/5 seems to me to be the meaning of Diod. XVI 76, 6, the phrase *μέχρι τῆς Φιλίππου τελευτῆς* referring to the only Philip who is possible in the context of book XVI. Jacoby (73 T 2), following Schaefer, *Hist. Zeitschr.* XVIII 173, assumes the statement in D. to refer to the whole of Diyllus' work and therefore equates the name Philip with the son of Cassander; but D.'s context cannot bear this interpretation, and the fact that F 1 dating to 316/5 is numbered to the ninth book (or Syntaxis

suggested by the feminine gender of *ἐν τῇ ἐνάτῃ*) implies that the scale of Diyllus' books is such as would admit of his devoting one book to the last years of Philip's reign. If my interpretation of 76, 6 is accepted, then we have another exception to D.'s general practice of giving only the summary scope of a historian's work; this anomaly can best be explained (as in the case of 71, 3) by the hypothesis that D. was excerpting Diyllus Syntaxis II for the period 341/0 to 336/5.

² I have discussed the chronological system of Diodorus in *J.H.S.* LVII (1937), p. 54 f.

was cut up to go under each archon-year. Similarly for the early stages of Dion's career he used Theopompus; that excerpt was also allocated to archon-years. Finally his date-table noted the Social War at this period; he took an excerpt from the continuation of Ephorus (i.e. Diyllus Syntaxis I) and split that under two archon-years which marked the beginning and end of the Social War. The whole appears as the first twenty-two chapters of the book: it is an attempt to combine the merits of two systems of historiography, the annalistic and the *κατὰ γένος* systems, an attempt which in the hands of Diodorus leads to a considerable confusion. Moreover, as Diodorus was not writing on a great scale, he had to consider the total length of his book; rather than present a uniform product by levelling up his excerpts, he simply omitted chunks of narrative which he considered unimportant or uninteresting—for instance five years of the Sacred War and ten years of Sicilian history—even though they were contained in the source he was using; to take the place of a narrative he inserted under the archon-year an entry from a text-book (much of the history of Philip results from such a process). Finally, when the whole book had been equipped with excerpts and citations under archon-years, Diodorus added a number of link-phrases, a reference or two to contemporary times, an occasional cross-reference, a number of refrain-passages to lend some colour of unity, and an Epilogue to balance the Proem; his work was completed and he left the mantle to fall upon the shoulders of his critics.

The following chart of conclusions, which is appended for convenience of reference, does not include the sentences, which proceed from Diodorus' own invention,¹ the extracts from the chronographic and bibliographical tables, or the citations from the text-book, which fill the gaps between the more detailed narratives:²

XVI 1	Proem	Ephorus, Proem to XXVII
3-4	Philip	Ephorus XXVII
5-6	Sicily	Theopompus XLI
7, 3	Social War	Diyllus Syntaxis I
8	Philip	Ephorus XXVII
9-13	Sicily	Theopompus XLI
14	Philip	Ephorus XXVII
15-20	Sicily	Theopompus XLI
21-22	Social War	Diyllus Syntaxis I
23-33	Sacred War	Ephorus XXX (Demophilus)
34, 1-2	Asia Minor	Ephorus XXVI
35-39	Sacred War	Ephorus XXX (Demophilus)
40, 3-52, 8	Persia	Ephorus XXVI
53-55	Olynthian War	Diyllus Syntaxis I
56-63	Sacred War	Ephorus XXX (Demophilus)
64	Appendix to Sacred War	Diyllus Syntaxis I
65-69, 6	Sicily	Theopompus XLI
70	Sicily	Theopompus XLI
72-73	Sicily	Timaeus
74-76	Perinthus	Ephorus XXVI
77, 2-3	Byzantium	Diyllus Syntaxis II
77, 4-83	Sicily	Timaeus
84-88, 2	Philip	Diyllus Syntaxis II
90, 1	Sicily	Timaeus
91-94	Philip	Diyllus Syntaxis II

¹ E.g. those noted in Article I, p. 79, n. 4, and p. 89 and *passim*.

² Cf. Article I, pp. 90-91; for the Sicilian

narrative one may add 7, 1; 31, 7; 36, 5; 45, 9.

The contents of the books from which Diodorus derived his material have been defined in the course of this paper as follows:

Ephorus XXVI (finished): Persian affairs down to 341/o.

XXVII (unfinished): Greek, including Macedonian, affairs 362 to 356 B.C.

XXX (Demophilus): Monograph on the Sacred War 357/6 to 346/5.

Diyllus Syntaxis I (supplement to Ephorus¹): Greek and Sicilian affairs 357/6 to 341/o.

Diyllus Syntaxis II: Greek and Persian affairs 340/339 to 336/5.

Theopompus² XLI: Sicilian affairs down to 343/2.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Ephorus XXVIII-XXIX: Sicilian affairs 392 B.C. to 357/6.

² Theopompus XXXIX-XLI: Sicilian affairs 392/1 to 343/2.

THE CONSTITUTION OF DRACONTIDES.

LYSIAS (XII. 73), describing how the Thirty were established in the government of Athens, begins with the sentence ἀναστὰς δὲ Θηραμένης ἐκέλευσεν ὑμᾶς τριάκοντα ἀνδράσιν ἐπιτρέψαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ χρῆσθαι ἣν Δρακοντίδης ἀπέφαινε. Commenting on the last clause the judicious Thirlwall¹ observes that 'the precise meaning of these words is very doubtful. There is almost equal difficulty, whether we suppose that they refer to a proposition then made, or to one which was to be made, by Dracontides.' Thirlwall has not expressed his meaning as precisely as Lysias; the uncertainty lies, not in the words, nor in the reference intended by Lysias, but in the mind of the historian, who is conscious that, whether he refers the proposition of Dracontides to the occasion indicated by Lysias or to another, he will encounter almost equal difficulty. The difficulty however, arising from the apparent inconsistencies in the evidence of the ancient authorities on the date of the appointment of the Thirty, is not Thirlwall's only, and after a century of discussion it still vexes every student of the period.

On the one hand, Xenophon (II. iii. 1-3),² starting on the new year³ (which he ought strictly to have begun immediately after the capitulation of Athens but has postponed in order to round off the story of the surrender with the conclusion of the peace and Lysander's entry into the Piraeus on the 16th of Munychion⁴), tells us that the Athenians decreed to elect thirty Commissioners οἱ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους συγγράψουσι, καθ' οὓς πολιτεύσουσι, and that thereupon Lysander sailed to Samos and Agis evacuated Attica. The constitutional question sprang directly out of the treaty of peace, as Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 34. 3) and Diodorus (XIV. 3) expressly note, and presumably the Commission was set up forthwith. Lysias in his speech against Agoratus (XIII. 34) confirms Xenophon's chronology, for he comprises the appointment of the Thirty with Lysander's εἰσπλους and the surrender of the ships and the demolition of the walls in the direct consequences of the imprisonment of the recalcitrant democrats. Similarly Andocides (I. 80) mentions together, without any hint of a break, the peace, the demolition of the walls, the return of the exiles, and the appointment of the Thirty. From these passages one would gather that the Thirty were elected just after the peace, before Lysander sailed to Samos, and that they were elected to draw up the πατριος πολιτεία in accordance with the treaty.

On the other hand, Lysias in his speech against Eratosthenes (XII. 71-76, cited above) gives a narrative of the institution of the Thirty quite incompatible in several points with that evidence. (1) They were elected at the meeting of the Assembly convoked to decide on the constitution.⁵ Theramenes had prevented that meeting until Lysander should be present, whom he summoned from Samos with his fleet. It was a preconceived scheme, and we cannot suppose that Lysander agreed to

includes the events of that day (*cap.* ii. 23) in τούτων δὲ πραχθέντων (*cap.* iii. 3).

Whatever may be the extent of the interpolations, the election of the Thirty here cannot be cut out of the genuine text, for it is implied in the opening sentence of section 11.

⁴ Plut. *Lys.* 15. Cf. *C.Q.* XXXI, 1937, pp. 32-37.

⁵ Clearly distinct from 'the meeting about the peace', *Lys.* XIII. 17.

¹ *History of Greece*, ed. 1839, ch. xxxi, p. 175, note 3.

² When I refer to Xenophon *tout court*, I refer to his *Hellenica*.

³ The year, stripped of the amplifications wherein the Interpolator has wrapped it, is of course the Thucydidean year, beginning from the spring. Munychion 16 (April 22) really falls within it, but Xenophon for historical reasons has anticipated that day; yet he no doubt

interrupt
the mee
respons
(XIV. 3
appoint
against
dorus (2
demolis
context
allowed
will app
by the
δημοκρα
five.² T
time mu
change
agendum
ἐποίουν.
State to
Here is
and the
constitut
XXXviri
tion itself
So i
ing in th
choosing
Thirty w
treaty of
with the
two stag
authoriti
concerne
led, into
Fur
downfall
the year
Within t
collecting

¹ XII. 7
θαι, ἕως ὃ ὧ
MS ἕως ὃ
αὐτοῦ ἐτηρή
δρου ναὺς ἐν
στρατόπεδοι
ὑπὸ Λυσάν
might so in
first of TI
pronouns v
not unpara
p. 36, note
Theramene
² *Lys.* X
I. ii. 24. (I
iii. 34.)

interrupt the siege; the arrangement must have been that Theramenes should delay the meeting until after the capture of Samos, and although Lysias puts as much responsibility as he can upon Theramenes,¹ Diodorus is no doubt right in saying (XIV. 3) that Lysander had taken the city before the message came. Thus the appointment of the Thirty is placed after, instead of before, Lysander's operations against Samos. (2) Lysander told the Assembly *ὅτι παρασπόνδους ὑμᾶς ἔχει*. Diodorus (XIV. 3) and Plutarch (*Lys.* 15) supply the reason, that the walls had not been demolished within the time allowed by the terms of the peace, and Lysias in another context (XIII. 15-16) extenuates, but therefore admits, the default. The time allowed for so big a task cannot have been less than several months, and the interval will apply to the appointment of the Thirty. (3) Ten of the Thirty were designated by the five oligarchic Ephors. These Ephors were created by the oligarchs *δημοκρατίας ἔτι οὐσης*, but after the return of the exiles, for Critias was one of the five.² They were the germ of the revolution, *ὅθεν τῆς στάσεως ἤρξαν*, but sufficient time must be given for its development between the conclusion of the peace and the change of the constitution. (4) The business to be considered by the Assembly, the *agendum* for the meeting, was 'the constitution'—*περὶ τῆς πολιτείας τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐποιοῦν*. Theramenes bade the assembled people 'to commit the government of the State to Thirty citizens and to adopt the constitution which Dracontides announced'. Here is no longer any question of formulating the *πάτριος νόμοι*; the draft is finished and the Bill engrossed; Dracontides is moving the adoption of an already made constitution which he proposes on the spot³; the Thirty are no longer to be *XXXviri legibus scribundis* but a Board of Governors elected under the new constitution itself.

So it appears that there are two accounts of the institution of the Thirty differing in the time of their appointment and in the character of their office. Instead of choosing between the two I am prepared to accept both, and to believe that the Thirty were elected as a Commission to draw up the *πάτριος πολιτεία* soon after the treaty of peace, and again at a later date as a Government established in accordance with the constitution which they had meanwhile produced. The two elections or two stages in the establishment of the Thirty are not clearly distinguished in our authorities because Xenophon is deliberately reticent on the subject, Lysias is not concerned to give a complete account, and the later writers have fallen, or been misled, into confusions.

Further considerations support this conclusion. Reckoned backwards from its downfall the government of the Thirty appears to have begun late in the autumn of the year 404. The Thirty were deposed on the day after the battle at Munichia.⁴ Within ten days after the battle the democrats raided the country from the Piraeus, collecting wood and fruit.⁵ The fruit, on any natural interpretation, implies that the

¹ XII. 71, *οὐ πρότερον ἔλασε τὴν ἐκκλησίαν γενέσθαι, ἕως ὃ ὠμολογημένος* (so Westermann, for the MS *ἕως ὃ λεγόμενος*) *ὑπ' ἐκείνου καιρὸς ἐπιμελῶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐτηρήθη, καὶ μετεπέμψατο μὲν τὰς μετὰ Λυσάνδρου ναὺς ἐκ Σάμου, ἐπεδήμησε δὲ τὸ τῶν πολεμίων στρατόπεδον*. For *ὑπ' ἐκείνου* one would expect *ὑπὸ Λυσάνδρου*; by a stretch of prolepsis one might so interpret it, but the reader would think first of Theramenes—(the conjunction of the pronouns with reference to the same person is not unparalleled, v. G. Colin, *Xenophon historien*, p. 36, note)—and Lysias is keen to represent Theramenes as the prime mover.

² Lys. XII. 43. Cf. Xen. II. iii. 15, 36; *Mem.* I. ii. 24. (Was Theramenes another? Xen. II. iii. 34.)

³ The mood and tense of the verb *ἀπέφαινε* admit of no other interpretation, and Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 34. 3) strongly corroborates Lysias in this point—*καταπλαγείν ὁ δῆμος ἠναγκάσθη χειροτονεῖν τὴν ὀλιγαρχίαν. ἔγραψε δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα Δρακοντίδης Ἀφιδναῖος*.

⁴ *Τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ*, Xen. II. iv. 23, Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 38. If Xenophon's *τὸ τελευταῖον* covers a longer interval, it cannot be more than a few days.

⁵ Xen. II. iv. 25; *ξύλα καὶ ὄπωραν*. The conjecture *δοπρία* is not convincing. I make an opponent the present of an alternative, *καθ' ἡμέραν*; but conjectural emendation is here inadmissible.

season was after midsummer. At the earliest therefore the battle was fought about midsummer. Now Xenophon (II. iv. 21) represents Cleocritus as saying in his appeal on the day of the battle that the Thirty had killed almost more of the Athenians in eight months than the Peloponnesians in ten years of fighting. The eight months put the beginning of their government near the end of October. Cleocritus, to be sure, was rhetorically, and perhaps politically, interested in cutting the period of the massacres as short as possible, and he might reckon it, not from the appointment of the Thirty, but from the opening of their Reign of Terror.¹ But other evidence indicates that he (or Xenophon) meant the former. For Lysander's return from Samos to install the Thirty must be placed at the close of the summer. We have seen that Diodorus puts it after the capture of Samos, and that all probabilities favour that sequence; but further, the words of Lysias (quoted above p. 153, note 1) imply that Lysander brought his whole forces, both fleet and army,² and therefore had finished the campaign, and Xenophon (II. iii. 8) states that after settling the affairs of Samos Lysander sailed home to Lacedaemon, taking with him among other trophies the triremes from the Piraeus (except twelve). Both Lysias and Xenophon here 'let the cat out of the bag' and convict themselves of a *suppressio veri*; Lysias has ignored any other reasons for Lysander's return to Attica than the summons from Theramenes; Xenophon has carefully avoided any mention of Lysander's return or of any of the transactions there connected with it, but these triremes betray his secret, for we cannot believe that Lysander transported them to Samos from and back to the Piraeus, where he could have left them in the safe custody of his decarchs and their guards.³ Lysander therefore was on his way home. Arrived there he delivered his spoils to the Lacedaemonians *τελευτώντος τοῦ θέρους*.

Although I am inclined to regard⁴ these last words as part of the note here interpolated into Xenophon's text by the ancient editor or commentator who has attempted without much success to puzzle out the chronology of the war, yet I am convinced that in this point he is right. *A priori*, Lysander was not the man to curtail or abate his autocratic power by demobilizing his forces before the end of his year of command or the approach of the winter. As a matter of fact, the structural scheme of Xenophon's narrative (II. iii. 1-14, without the interpolations) confirms the autumnal date for the election of the Thirty as a constitutional government. He notices (1-3) the appointment of the thirty Commissioners in the spring, and the departure of Lysander and Agis from Attica; his account (6-8) of Lysander's conquest of Samos and homegoing represents the events of the summer; next, reverting to the Thirty, he dismisses their first proceedings with a cursory mention (11-12, cf. 38) which is in effect, from the standpoint already reached in section 8, a retrospect; and then he resumes (13) the main course of his history at the juncture when the oligarchic faction of the Thirty, bent on entrenching themselves in their new position of power against the opposition of the moderates, applied to Lysander, now back in Lacedaemon, for a garrison *ἕως δὴ τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκποδῶν ποιησάμενοι καταστήσαντο τὴν πολιτείαν*.⁵ A little farther on (25-26) he puts into the mouth of Critias, attacking Theramenes in the Council, a reference to what is obviously the same change in the constitution—*σὺν τῇ Λακεδαιμονίων γνώμῃ τήνδε τὴν πολιτείαν καθίσταμεν. καὶ ἐὰν τινα αἰσθανόμεθα ἐναντίον τῇ ὀλιγαρχίᾳ, ὅσον δυνάμεθα ἐκποδῶν ποιοῦμεθα*. Both passages refer to 'the constitution' as an accomplished fact, and

On my interpretation the difference between these *termini a quibus* is negligible, but at this stage I allow the distinction for the sake of the argument.

² Diodorus says that he brought 100 ships, which would be only half his fleet, if he still had the original number (Xen. II. ii. 5, 7, cf. 9), but Xenophon notes that he dismissed the navy

of the allies and sailed for Lacedaemon with the Laconian ships. It is enough that he brought the residue.

³ *Vide C.Q.* XXXII. 1938, pp. 25-6.

⁴ With Beloch, *G.G.* 2 III. 2, pp. 208-9.

⁵ Diodorus (XIV. 4) paraphrases *ἤτήσαντο παρὰ Λακεδαιμονίων φρουράν, λέγοντες ὅτι τὴν πολιτείαν καταστήσουσιν ἐκείνοις συμφέροντα*.

although decreed constituted καθίστα, privileg question when L to death ance wi

Ari the Xen In agre immedia obliterate Thirty v although Yet all invalida of imme tole pro Attic ne the laps from the lying mo ing upon covering authors, Therame later, an ἀρχοντες witnesses: Aris

ἀρχοντος, Draconti Athenian Pythodor year wit Beloch we supp Thirty w

This exercised but that συγγραφε

¹ So too (Xen. II. iii there quot recent con law (*Ath. R*

² Xen. II τε και θαυμ

³ Lys. 15 Plutarch's

although Xenophon has deliberately omitted its enactment, it is clear that it had been decreed by the Assembly. It is also clear that the enactment was recent,¹ for the constitution was not yet firmly established (Critias still uses the present tense *καθίσταμεν*), and its provisions were not fully carried out; in particular the list of the privileged citizens had not been completed, and there were many intrigues and questionings on the subject of the franchise.² But if the constitution was so recent when Lysander had got home to Sparta and when Critias was putting Theramenes to death, it cannot have been set up in the spring, but must be presumed, in accordance with the other indications, to have been enacted in the autumn.

Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 34.5) and Diodorus (XIV. 3.4) follow what may be called the Xenophontic tradition very closely, but foist into it one remarkable deviation. In agreement with Xenophon they place the election of the thirty Commissioners immediately after the treaty of peace, but they combine with it the meeting, obliterated by Xenophon, at which Dracontides enunciated his constitution and the Thirty were established in the government. Plutarch³ makes the same combination, although he revokes it by a subsequent mention of the establishment of the Thirty. Yet all three writers, with superb insouciance, while identifying the two occasions, invalidate the identification by incidental evidence incompatible with it; for instead of immediately after the treaty of peace, concluded on the 16th of Munychion,⁴ Aristotle proceeds to date this single first and last election after the beginning of the Attic new year; Diodorus and Plutarch put it after the capture of Samos and after the lapse of the time allowed for the demolition of the walls. Moreover it is plain from the account of Diodorus especially, but also from Aristotle's,⁵ that the underlying motive for the combination is to vindicate the conduct of Theramenes by insisting upon his opposition to Lysander and the oligarchs at the first election and covering up his collaboration with them at the second. One may infer that these authors, perplexed by Xenophon's reticence, and misguided by some apology for Theramenes published after his death, have confused the earlier election with the later, and the Thirty *συγγραφείς* appointed on the one occasion with the Thirty *ἄρχοντες* appointed on the other. Once the contamination is recognized, they become witnesses in support of the case here presented.

Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 35. 1) dates the appointment of the Thirty *ἐπὶ Πυθοδώρου ἄρχοντος*, and he is expressly referring to their appointment in accordance with Dracontides' decree (34. 3). Xenophon's Interpolator on the contrary avers that the Athenians deleted the name of Pythodorus and called the year *Anarchia* because Pythodorus had been elected *ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ*,⁶ and Diodorus (XIV. 3) introduces the year with the rubric *ἀναρχίας οὐσης Ἀθήνησι διὰ τὴν κατάλυσιν τῆς ἡγεμονίας*. As Beloch observes,⁷ nobody can be his own father; but the puzzle is solved if we suppose that Pythodorus was appointed by the Thirty *συγγραφείς* and the Thirty were appointed as a Board of Governors in the archonship of Pythodorus.

This solution of the riddle of the date postulates that the Thirty Commissioners exercised large administrative powers and were in fact a Provisional Government; but that they had such powers might be expected from the precedent of the *συγγραφείς αὐτοκρατόρες* in 411,⁸ and is positively attested, not only by phrases used

¹ So too the expression *ἐν τοῖς καινοῖς νόμοις* (Xen. II. iii. 51), with reference to the only law there quoted, suggests a constitution, and a recent constitution. Aristotle's supplementary law (*Ath. Pol.* 37) is another question.

² Xen. II. iii. 17, πολλοὶ δὲλοι ἦσαν συνιστάμενοι τε καὶ θαυμάζοντες τί ἔσοιτο ἡ πολιτεία.

³ Lys. 15. We need not stop to unravel all Plutarch's perplexities.

⁴ Plut. *ibid.* Cf. C.Q. XXXI, 1937, p. 37.

⁵ Cf. C.Q. XXXII, 1938, pp. 23-4.

⁶ Xen. II. iii. 1. Aristotle however (*Ath. Pol.* 35, 41) and even democratic Lysias (VII. 9) use the name of Pythodorus to denote the year.

⁷ G.G. II². i. p. 431.

⁸ Thuc. VIII. 67.

by Aristotle and Diodorus,¹ which might be taken to refer to the Constitutional Thirty, but by their recorded acts. From the beginning they intervened in the judicial administration,² and they appointed a Council of 500 and officials to fill the ordinary civil magistracies, including of course the nine archons.³ These appointments were no doubt made in time for the Attic new year, for there is no trace of any interval or disturbance of the normal routine between the archonships of Alexias and Pythodorus,⁴ and it is incredible that any government at Athens should have dispensed with the ordinary administrative machinery during the whole of the summer until the constitution of Dracontides was enacted.

The result of the foregoing discussion is that the value of the testimony of Lysias has been vindicated. Whereas Xenophon has muffled the re-establishment of the Thirty, as no longer a Provisional but a Constitutional government, in vague ambiguous phrases,⁵ which later writers helplessly echo or misconstrue,⁶ the plain speaking of Lysias has rescued for our information an essential fact without which the history of the revolution would have been unintelligible. The recognition of the double election of the Thirty, and of the distinction between their first appointment as *συγγραφείς* and their second appointment as *ἄρχοντες* under the constitution of Dracontides, clears up the whole course of events and enables us to understand the accounts given by the various authorities and to reconcile their differences.

I proceed to apply this conclusion to explain the problem of the fall of Theramenes, a solution of which will strongly confirm its truth; but a supplementary point must first be dealt with, which will also serve as an introduction to that problem.

Lysias in the passage in question (XII. 71-76) is not concerned with the election of the original Thirty commissioned to draw up the *πάτριοι νόμοι*; he naturally avoids any reference to it, because Theramenes was on that occasion the opponent of Lysander and the oligarchs,⁷ and the Thirty then appointed had a not altogether discreditable record;⁸ but he dwells at length upon the second election, when Theramenes co-operated with those enemies of the democracy in setting up the Thirty who perpetrated the crimes of the Reign of Terror. But although neither Lysias nor any other writer tells us the exact composition of the first Thirty, its general character may be inferred with some confidence. Were the first Thirty the same men as the second Thirty? On the one hand no change in the personnel is anywhere noted, and the silence of the authorities might be interpreted to mean that there was none. On the other hand the words of Lysias *τριάκοντα ἀνδράσιν ἐπιτρέψαι τὴν πόλιν*, quoted no doubt from the decree of Dracontides either directly or through the speech wherewith Theramenes introduced it,⁹ postulate a fresh election, and the method employed certainly suggests a fresh list of nominees, at any rate of the Ten elected *ἐκ τῶν παρόντων*. The ambiguity of the term 'The Thirty' in denotation and

¹ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 1, *γενόμενοι κύριοι τῆς πόλεως*. Diod. XIV. 3, *ἀφ' ἡγεμονίας τῆς πολιτείας καὶ πάντα διοικήσαντας τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν*. . . *διοικήσαντες τὰ κοινὰ τῆς πόλεως*. The subsequent statement, *ἔδει δὲ τοὺς ἡρημένους βουλὴν τε καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς καταστήσαι κ.τ.λ.*, is merely derived from Xenophon and from the fact which he records.

² Lys. XIII. 34-36; Xen. II. iii. 12, 28, 38; cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 3; Diod. XIV. 4.

³ Xen. II. iii. 11, 38; cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 1; Diod. *l.c.*; Lys. XIII. 20.

⁴ Vide Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athens*, p. 148 (where, by the way, 'one and one-half months' is a slip of the pen for 'two and one-

half months').

⁵ Xen. II. iii. 13, *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤρξαντο βουλευέσθαι ὥπως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ αὐτοῖς τῇ πόλει χρῆσθαι ὥπως βούλοιντο*. 28, *νῦν ἐπεὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς φανερώς ἐχθροὶ τῷ δήμῳ γεγενήμεθα*.

⁶ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 3, *ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν πόλιν ἐγκρατέστερον ἔσχον*. Diod. XIV. 4, *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα βουλόμενοι βιαιότερα καὶ παράνομα πράττειν*. Sall. *Cat.* 51, *Post ubi paulatim licentia crevit*.

⁷ Diod. XIV. 3; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 34. 3. Cf. *C.Q.* XXXII. 1938, pp. 23-4.

⁸ Xen. II. iii. 12, 38; Lys. XII. 5, XXV. 19, 27; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 2, 3; Diod. XIV. 4; Sall. *Cat.* 51.

⁹ Cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 29. 1.

connota
doubtle
Commis
and wit
election
as most
Thirty
tion of
chosen
nated by
the Ass
composi
of the t
effected
elected i

Ho
Theram
at least
brought
by his fl
were bu
imprison
patronag
factions
inclined
anxious
sentative
tion of th
the day o
the comp
between
the circu
upon wh
to be sec
undispute

For
had to be
the midd
Lysias co
the obscu
were corr
lost prerog
tions, exa
of Terror
the new m
roll of vic
to account
against it
and his m

¹ Lys. XI.

² C.Q. XX

³ Referen

⁴ Xen. II.

connotation is no objection, for it is a collective title used by our authorities, and doubtless by the Athenians at large, conventionally and indifferently to describe the Commission or the Government, whatever its tenure or its membership at the time, and without reference to its component persons. It appears therefore that the fresh election is indubitable and new members are probable; but we may assume that, just as most of the Councillors were reappointed at the new year,¹ so most of the original Thirty were re-elected under the new constitution. Further, the equal representation of the three parties, which was the principle whereon the second Thirty were chosen and is clearly stated by Lysias—ten nominated by Theramenes, ten designated by the oligarchic Ephors, and ten elected from among the citizens present in the Assembly—may be confidently assumed to have reproduced the proportional composition of the first Thirty. The number thirty, that is to say three from each of the ten Tribes, indicates as much; and the principle expresses the compromise effected by Theramenes between the three parties when the Commissioners were elected immediately after the treaty of peace.

However that may be, there can be no doubt that it was just at that time that Theramenes was at the height of his revived ascendancy, and that his influence was at least no less potent on the first than on the second Thirty. Lysander had been brought to terms,² and his withdrawal to Samos had relieved the pressure exercised by his fleet; the exiled chiefs of the oligarchs were not yet firmly re-established and were busy in organizing their forces; the democrats had been pruned by the imprisonment of their recalcitrant champions and had no other hope than in such patronage as the leader of the moderates might extend to them; neither of these factions was prepared to risk an immediate contest, but both were for the moment inclined to look to Theramenes for guidance and support. To the citizens in general, anxious to get on with the repair of their shattered fortunes, the Commission representative of the three parties could be recommended as a fair and acceptable solution of the present difficulty of determining the future constitution, and it postponed the day of the decision. To Theramenes, in whom we must recognize the author of the compromise, it was an excellent arrangement; not only he held the balance between the oligarchic and the democratic sections on the Commission, but also from the circumstances of their election the latter must have been very tame democrats, upon whom he could rely almost as a left wing of his own followers. He appeared to be securely established in a very strong position; we should expect him to wield undisputed authority and to have everything his own way.

For a time he did; the refractory diehards of the democratic party, to be sure, had to be executed, but the first measures of the Thirty were those most desired by the middle party and were not unwelcome to moderate opinion outside it—even Lysias condones them when his case allows; the sycophants were suppressed and the obscurities of which they had taken advantage in the laws were clarified, abuses were corrected, corrupt practices abolished, and the Areopagus was reinstated in its lost prerogatives.³ But ere long a change comes over the administration; proscriptions, exactions, confiscations, tyrannical outrages spring up and lead on to a Reign of Terror, in which even highly respected citizens who had no particular quarrel with the new régime and inoffensive resident aliens perished indiscriminately, until the roll of victims mounted, it was said, to no less than fifteen hundred.⁴ How are we to account for this abrupt transformation? how did Theramenes, who strove against it till his death, lose his apparently secure ascendancy? how did Critias and his minority succeed in dominating the government?

¹ Lys. XIII. 20.

² C.Q. XXXII. 1938, pp. 22-6.

³ References in note 8, p. 156.

⁴ Xen. II. iii. 14-15, 21-2, 38-41, iv. 21; Lys. 35. 4; Diod. XIV. 4, 5; Sall. Cat. 51.

XII. 6-7, 82-3, 96-7, XVIII. 4-6; Andoc. I. 94, 101-2; Plato, *Apol.* 32c, *Epist.* vii. 324e; Isocr.

VII. 67, XX. 11, XXI. 12; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.*

The answer is to be found, I believe, in the new constitution, the constitution of Dracontides. But how can that enactment have destroyed the supremacy of Theramenes? for on the face of it the composition of the new government, the Thirty elected under its provisions, appears to confirm his position as securely as ever. The explanation lies in the principle on which the constitution was built. This fundamental base was the principle of rotation in office of the privileged citizens. It was dear to the democrats, but no less to the oligarchs, and above all to the theoretical reformers.¹ That it underlay the design of Dracontides' constitution may be demonstrated by two cases which exhibit it in action.

(1) Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 35. 1), in agreement with Xenophon, Diodorus, and Lysias,² notices that the Thirty appointed 500 Councillors and the other officials. The occasion, we have seen, must have been towards the close of the year of the archon Alexias, when the Thirty, although armed with exceptional authority, were still Commissioners acting, as it were under a power of attorney, in the name of the Athenian people and administering the democratic constitution. The appointments were the ordinary appointments in preparation for the new year; the number 500 and the observance of the Tribal cycles³ are in accordance with the regular practice; apart from the autocratic mode of selection, one would never expect any departure from the normal usage, and none can be discerned in the other accounts. But Aristotle introduces an abnormal feature; the Thirty, he tells us, appointed the Councillors and officials *ἐκ προκρίτων ἐκ τῶν χιλίων*. These words have puzzled the editors and commentators, who have had recourse to conjectural emendation of the text or to improbable interpretations of its meaning, but a simple explanation is not far to seek. Aristotle, having antedated the constitution of Dracontides to the time of the establishment of the Thirty *συγγραφείς*,⁴ has imported this revolutionary innovation into the very humdrum appointment of the annual officials from the election afterwards held under the provisions of that constitution. The real sense of the words becomes clear in the light of a later passage (36. 1), where we read that the Thirty in answer to Theramenes' criticism *καταλέγουσιν τῶν πολιτῶν δισχιλίους*. The editors, to be sure, have with one accord obliterated this important evidence by substituting *τρισχιλίους* for *δισχιλίους*; but if we keep the text of the papyrus, the obvious meaning emerges, that the two thousand citizens then enrolled supplemented the one thousand already on the list, and so completed the three thousand prescribed by the new constitution. 'The Three Thousand' are clearly three distinct Thousands, one of which can be in existence and in function alone without the other two, and there can be no doubt that they were designed, like the four Councils of the Five Thousand in 411⁵ and the four Councils of the Boeotians, to rotate in office, *κατὰ μέρος ἐκάστη προκαθήμενη καὶ προβουλευούσα*.⁶

(2) The Thirty—ten nominated by Theramenes, ten designated by the oligarchic Ephors, ten elected from among the citizens in the Assembly—were by the method

¹ Aristot. *Pol.* IV. 1298a, VI. 1317b, VIII. 1332b, *Ath. Pol.* 4. 3, 30. 3, 43. 2, 62. 2; Thuc. VIII. 86, 92.

² References in note 3, p. 156.

³ Ferguson, *l.c.*

⁴ *Ath. Pol.* 34. 3; cf. 35. 1, *γενόμενοι δὲ κύριοι τῆς πόλεως, τὰ μὲν ἄλλα τὰ δόξαντα περὶ τῆς πολιτείας παρῶρων, πεντακοσίους δὲ βουλευτὰς κ.τ.λ.* This sentence well illustrates the contamination in Aristotle's account: it corresponds to Xenophon's *αἰρεθέντες δὲ ἐφ' ᾧ τε συγγράψαι νόμους, καθ' οὐσιν αὖτε πολιτεύουσιν, τοῦτους μὲν αἰεὶ ἐμμελῶς συγγράφειν τε καὶ ἀποδεικνύειν, βουλὴν δὲ κ.τ.λ.*, but whereas Xenophon plainly states that the

συγγραφείς were slow in producing their constitution, Aristotle, having already established the constitution, can only (or could only, if he were clear in his own mind) refer his own version of Xenophon's statement to the slowness of the (dominant section of the) Thirty *ἄρχοντες* in carrying out the whole of the provisions of the constitution or (for the clause is a nest of ambiguities) its requirements as to the number of the fully privileged citizens. Diodorus has been misled into the same error, but has evaded this particular pitfall.

⁵ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 30. 3, 31. 3.

⁶ Hell. Oxyrh. xi. 2. Cf. Thuc. V. 38.

of their
that in
death or
whose te
that only
the Exec
three Te

The
were act
collectiv
menes, C
in Plato
condemn
were put
τριάκοντα
subsequ
Critias an
of the Th

If it
rotate in
turn or in
the new
Critias an
selves. T
elements

Ther
won by h
administra
the middle
the curtain
become m
the same
a second
assistance
more a pr
betrayed t
them; but
not play th
Acropolis.
Alcibiades
Theramene
Thrasylu
the Thirty

¹ Compare
καὶ τῇ ἐκείνων
not quite the

In Thucyd
put their pr
the story pr
one. Was t
did the Boe
one Council
got no furth

² Xenopho

of their appointment three distinct Tens. Now Xenophon (II. iii. 21, 41) tells us that in order to get money to pay their guards the Thirty decided to seize and put to death one μέτοικος apiece and confiscate his property. But from Lysias (XII. 7), whose testimony is indisputable, for he was one of their intended victims, it is clear that only ten μέτοικοι were in fact arrested. One Ten therefore is acting alone as the Executive of the whole Board of Thirty, and we may conclude that each of the three Tens was designed to take its turn in the government of the State.

The term 'the Thirty' may well have been used conventionally when Ten only were acting on behalf and in the name of the whole college of governors; it is their collective and official title; they are still 'the Thirty' after the deaths of Theramenes, Critias, and Hippomachus and the defection of Pheidon. Similarly Socrates in Plato's *Apology* (32b) and Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 34. 1) can speak of the generals condemned after the battle of Arginusae as 'the ten generals', although only six were put on trial. When Xenophon (II. iii. 18) speaks of Κριτίας καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τριάκοντα, on the face of it an inaccurate although not unnatural expression amended subsequently (II. iv. 8) into Κριτίας τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι τῶν τριάκοντα, he means, I believe, Critias and his colleagues in the oligarchic Ten then acting as the executive section of the Thirty.¹

If it be accepted that the three Tens, with their correlative Thousands, were to rotate in office, and that the oligarchic Ten by arrangement or by lot secured the first turn or innings, the change in the character of the government on the enactment of the new constitution and the downfall of Theramenes are sufficiently explained. Critias and his section had got into power and were bent upon keeping it for themselves. They set to work on purging the coalition of its Liberal and Moderate elements and finally, above all, of Theramenes.

Theramenes was more tightly bound than his adversaries to the compromise won by his clever diplomacy over the peace. The interval of the Commissioners' administration had, we may suppose, strengthened the extreme parties rather than the middle; the democrats had become less amenable and less ready to acquiesce in the curtailment of their liberties; the oligarchs had reorganized their forces and become more indispensable. The political situation was not unlike that in 411, but the same methods could not be repeated. The People could not be persuaded a second time to a voluntary modification of the constitution; Lysander's coercive assistance was needed to carry out the revolution. Theramenes had to concede once more a preliminary spell of power to the oligarchs, and probably hoped that, if they betrayed their trust or indulged in excesses, he would head a reaction and depose them; but they had learnt their lesson in 411 and were determined that he should not play the same game again. The installation of the Laconian garrison on the Acropolis corresponds to the fortification of Eetioneia, and Thrasybulus at Phyle to Alcibiades at Samos, the armed force in the background behind the opposition; but Theramenes failed to prevent the one and to provide the other until too late.² Thrasybulus inherited from Alcibiades the rôle of the Hero of the Restoration, but the Thirty had destroyed any hopes of a Moderate constitution and it was the old

¹ Compare Lysias, XII. 55. Χαρικλεί καὶ Κριτία καὶ τῇ ἐκείνων ἑταιρεία, although the reference is not quite the same.

In Thucydides' narrative V. 38 the Boeotarchs put their proposal to the four Councils, but as the story proceeds the four Councils become one. Was this a joint session of the four, or did the Boeotarchs deal throughout with only one Council representing κατὰ μέρος all four, and got no further?

² Xenophon (II. iii. 13-14, 20, 42, 55-6, iv. 2)

narrates the occupation of the Acropolis, the murder of Theramenes, and the seizure of Phyle, in that order. Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 37) reverses the sequence, but his account, the source and intention of which are problematical, can hardly be upheld against Xenophon's. No doubt it serves to emphasize the collaboration of Theramenes with Thrasybulus against the oligarchs and to absolve him of any share in the introduction of the Laconian garrison, but I think there are also less recondite reasons (see note 3, p. 160).

democracy that was restored. Theramenes placed too much faith in reason and the sanctity of laws and oaths, but these are broken reeds in times of civil strife. He did however earn a posthumous halo of martyrdom in the cause of τὸ μέσον, and his political doctrines are enshrined in the works of Aristotle.

The foregoing interpretation of the constitution of Dracontides may be supported by other arguments. (1) There is no trace of στρατηγοί during the domination of the Thirty; the ten generals of the year of Alexias, some of whom were put to death as soon as the Commissioners got into power,¹ appear to have had no successors in the next year. The suggestion is obvious, that they were replaced by the Tens of the Thirty in turn. (2) Diodorus (XIV. 32; cf. Justin V. ix. 13) tells us that after their repulse at Phyle the Thirty invited Thrasybulus to join them in the government in place of Theramenes with ten of his own expatriated adherents. No doubt he uses a loose form of expression and means that Thrasybulus was to be δέκατος αὐτός, just as Theramenes was included in the Ten whom he nominated (Lys. XII. 76). The offer implies that the Tens were distinct units and the Theramenist Ten had been eliminated with their leader. (3) It is significant that the Thirty ruled for eight months, two thirds of the year. Presumably the scheme provided that each of the three Tens should conduct the administration for four months, but Theramenes' Ten dropped out, not only (I am inclined to believe) because they were dismissed on his execution, but also because they had been put in charge for the four months, July to October, before the new constitution was formally enacted, and were reckoned to have had their turn.² (4) The periods of four months may be detected beneath Aristotle's narrative and supply an easy explanation of his duplication of The Ten who succeeded the Thirty on their deposition. Blindfolded by Theramenes' apologist, whose misguidance we have noticed before, he has antedated the constitution of Dracontides and implied that it had already come into force when the Council and magistrates of the year of Pythodorus were appointed. He has thus, as the apologist intended, obliterated the turn or period during which Theramenes directed the government. The result is that the eight months of the 'constitutional' reign of the Thirty, the battle of Munichia, the fall of the Thirty, and the election of The Ten, are advanced by four months in the calendar.³ But when he comes to the real election of The Ten, which was presumably placed by common consent at mid-summer or thereabouts, Aristotle can only suppose them to be a second, separate, Ten. Yet the phrases wherewith (*Ath. Pol.* 38. 3) he accounts for the change of Tens might equally well refer to the situation immediately after the battle, as depicted by Xenophon (II. iv. 24-7), and might be read without misgivings as a summary of the passage of Diodorus (XIV. 33) which describes that situation and

¹ Lys. XIII. 30-43.

² My grounds are: (1) Lysias (XII. 76) places Theramenes' Ten first of the three Tens; (2) a substitute for the ten στρατηγοί would be needed during the first four months of the year of Pythodorus, and one of the Tens would be the simplest and most obvious; (3) this preliminary 'prytany' would help to account for the error of Aristotle and Diodorus in antedating the constitution; (4) we might expect the Thirty to adjust the administration to the calendar and make special arrangements for the fractional first year of the constitution so as to start fair on the next year (cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 31).

³ This chronological dislocation may be the primary reason why the seizure of Phyle by Thrasybulus is put before the execution of Theramenes. Theramenes' death would, we

may suppose, be pegged to a definite date by references independent of the authority which has tempted Aristotle astray, and be therefore a fixed point common to Aristotle and Xenophon. The snowstorm at Phyle demanded a winter month, but Aristotle's ἡδὲ τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐνεστῶτος (*Ath. Pol.* 37. 1) may be an accommodation, where τελευτῶντος would have been nearer to the truth; the latter would fit in better with Xenophon's narrative.

The postponement of the arrival of the Lacedaemonian guards is another question. The Ten, as the Thirty before them, had solicited aid from Lacedaemon (Xen. II. iv. 28; Lys. XII. 58-60; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 38. 1; Diod. XIV. 33), and if Callibius and his men took a prominent part in supporting them, there was an opportunity for confusion.

how it
assigne
has lu
effecte
(5) Th
place
obviou
and th
The Te
TH
reveale
ii. 35),
The T
appoint
ment o
outgoin
tion, ἐκ
ever, if
the spe
'the Th
they we
ἐγὼ δὲ (I
κατελέγη
in close
tion of I
numeric
ence, we
them.²
the new
chosen c
appointe
the enac
ingly the
turn as
The num
seat (cf.
Thousan
the offic
χρόνον (A

The
the Thre
than the
τοῦ καταλ
and the
constitut
which fun

¹ Lys. X
them, from
dozen lines
τριακοσίων
πεντακισχίλ
phanus may
as Hude's a

² Cf. Arist

how it led to the substitution of The Ten for the Thirty; and after all, having assigned to his first Ten substantially what other authorities attribute to The Ten, he has little or nothing left for his second Ten but their share in the reconciliation effected by aid of King Pausanias, on which he hastens to fix his whole attention. (5) The accession of the 'Ecclesiastic' Ten of the Thirty to the administration in place of the oligarchic Ten at the end of the first period of four months would obviously facilitate Aristotle's error, for the more democratic character of that Ten and the date of their entry upon office would predispose him to mistake them for The Ten who were their successors.

The Council provided by the constitution of Dracontides is very imperfectly revealed to us. The Councillors had to be at least 30 years of age (*Xen. Mem.* I. ii. 35), but that qualification might have been assumed without express authority. The Thirty appointed a Council of 500 members, but (as argued above) they appointed them near the end of the year of Alexias, four months before the enactment of the new constitution, and the 500 are the normal number to replace the outgoing Council. Aristotle has imported the procedure introduced by that constitution, ἐκ προκρίτων ἐκ τῶν χιλίων, but not the number prescribed by it. Lysias however, if his editors had let him say it,¹ has supplied the information; his client in the speech against Nicomachus denies the defendant's charge that he was one of 'the Three hundred', a charge so recklessly made by malicious slanderers that, if they were to be believed, the Three hundred would become more than a thousand; ἐγὼ δὲ (he protests) οὕτω πολλοὺ ἐδέξα τῶν τριακοσίων γενέσθαι, ὥστε οὐδὲ τῶν τρισχιλίων κατελέγην. The inference is obvious that these 'Three hundred', who stand at once in close relation and in antithesis to 'the Three thousand', are an organ of the constitution of Dracontides, intermediate between the Thirty and the Three thousand and in numerical harmony with both. The Thousands, as appears from Aristotle's reference, were not executive Councils, but a smaller inner Council was selected out of them.² The Three hundred may therefore be accepted as the Council established by the new constitution. It might have been taken for granted that 100 members were chosen out of each of the three Thousands, and in fact Aristotle refers to Councillors appointed ἐκ τῶν χιλίων, not ἐκ τῶν τρισχιλίων, and we have seen that for a time after the enactment of the constitution there was only one Thousand in being. Accordingly the Three hundred seem to have been three Hundreds, and perhaps served in turn as *πρυτάνεις*³ on the same rota as the three Tens and the three Thousands. The number of the *πρόκριτοι* is not defined; we might have expected ten for each seat (cf. *Ath. Pol.* 8. 1), but ten would make nonsense of the *πρόκρισις*, for all of the Thousand would be *πρόκριτοι* for the Hundred, and in a similar case, the election of the officers ἐκ τῶν αἰὶ βουλευόντων under the constitution of 411 εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον (*Ath. Pol.* 30. 2), the words *πλείους προκρίνοντας* suggest a lower figure.

The status of the Cavaliers (*ἱππεῖς*) is not clear. They are distinguished⁴ from the Three thousand, from τοὺς ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὀπλίτας, and from the hoplites other than the Laconians; these are synonymous terms, for on the disarmament τῶν ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου ἄλλων⁵ there were no Athenian hoplites left except the Three thousand, and the military register was brought into agreement with the political. The new constitution was based on the principle of citizenship for τοῖς ὅπλα παρεχομένοις, which furnished a rough *census* and excluded the *θητικὸν τέλος*. It might conceivably

¹ Lys. XXX. 7, 8. The editors, or most of them, from Taylor onwards have within half a dozen lines thrice changed the MS reading from *τριακοσίων* into *τετρακοσίων*, and *τρисχιλίων* into *πεντακισχιλίων*. Taylor's polemic against Stephanus may be justified on XXV. 9, but not here, as Hude's *apparatus criticus* proves.

² Cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 30. 3, 31. 1.

³ Cf. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 29. 5.

⁴ Xen. II. iv. 2, 9, 10.

⁵ Xen. II. iii. 20. Aristotle's brief notice (*Ath. Pol.* 37. 2) τὰ ὅπλα παρεδόντο πάντων πλὴν τῶν τρισχιλίων repeats Xenophon's τὰ ὅπλα πάντων πλὴν τῶν τρισχιλίων παρεδόντο, but omits this preliminary restriction of the πάντων.

have admitted *ὀπλιτεύοντες* as well as *ὀπλιτεύοντες* (cf. Aristot. *Pol.* 1297b), but were the Cavaliers included? 'Ο *κατάλογος* in Attic writers¹ normally refers to the roll of hoplites, but there was a supplementary catalogue of the *ἱππεῖς*,² and a general reference (e.g. Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 26. 1, Xen. II. iv. 28) would presumably comprise both. Against repeated notices³ of the enrolment, or the catalogue, of the Three thousand there is no express mention of the registration of the Cavaliers; but, although it is abundantly clear that the catalogue of the Three thousand was a register of the fully privileged citizens,⁴ *κοινωνοὶ τῶν πραγμάτων*, the Cavaliers also, with a regular establishment of 1,000 troopers,⁵ the flower of the noblest and richest families⁶ and the right arm of the new government, cannot have been excluded from all share in that citizenship.

It appears however that their share was subordinate and incomplete. They were enlisted at a very early age (Xen. *Hipparch.* i. 11-12), and many allusions convey the impression that they were quite young men. I surmise that they were normally superannuated at 30 years old,⁷ and so ranked in the quasi-political catalogue of the Thirty as a Cadet Corps, not yet qualified by age to be admitted to the constitutional functions of the Three thousand. Plato doubtless has them in mind when (*Resp.* 414b) from his *φύλακες παντελείς* he distinguishes *τοὺς νέους* rightly to be called *ἐπικούρους τε καὶ βοηθοὺς τοῖς τῶν ἀρχόντων δόγμασιν*, who (537 a-d), having been given a view from horseback of real fighting and on occasion a taste of blood, are to be trained for ten years from the age of 20 in the sciences propaedeutic to philosophy, and then at the age of 30 to be promoted on a system of *πρόκρισις* to higher duties and offices in the State. Whether the Cavaliers were secured against summary execution by order of the Thirty without a decree of the Council may be disputed; Aristotle confines the immunity to those enrolled on the catalogue of the Three thousand, but Xenophon allows a wider interpretation of the catalogue,⁸ and (as on the similar discrepancy about the disarmament) I prefer to trust Xenophon. Be that as it may, we may conclude on the whole question that the Cavaliers, as *ὅπλα παρεχόμενοι*,⁹ had a place in the constitution and enjoyed the privileges of the catalogue, but not those of the Three thousand.

The constitution of Dracontides, like the Commission of Thirty, was a compromise to which Theramenes was driven by the exigencies of the political situation. It is constructed on a tripartite scheme, whereas the precedent of the 'future' constitution of 411 with its fourfold divisions, the parallel of the four councils of the Boeotians, and the example of the four Tribes of the *πάτριος πολιτεία*, to which any plan inspired by Theramenes would presumably be affiliated, all lead us to expect

¹ E.g. Thuc. VI. 43, VII. 20, VIII. 24; Aristoph. *Eq.* 1369; Lys. XIV. 7, XV. 5, 7, 11.

² Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 49. 2. Cf. Lys. XIV. 8-10, XV. 5, 7, 11; Xen. *Hipparch.* i. 2, ix. 3.

³ Xen. II. iii. 18-20, 51-2; Lys. XXX. 8; Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 36. 1, 2, 37. 1.

⁴ Diodorus, XIV. 32, can with justice describe the rest of the Athenians as *οἱ μὴ μετέχοντες τῆς τῶν τρισχιλίων πολιτείας*.

⁵ Aristoph. *Eq.* 225; Xen. *Hipparch.* ix. 3; Philochorus ap. Hesych. s.v. *ἱππῆς*; cf. Thuc. II. 13, Andoc. III. 7, Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 24. 3.

⁶ Cf. Xen. *Eq.* ii. 1, *τάττονται μὲν γὰρ δὴ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἱππεύειν οἱ τοῖς χρήμασι τε ἱκανώτατοι καὶ τῆς πόλεως οὐκ ἐλάχιστον μετέχοντες*. *Hipparch.* i. 11-12.

⁷ Xenophon (*Hipparch.* i. 17; cf. ii. 3) alludes to *πρεσβύτεροι*, but (not to mention senior non-commissioned officers) he wrote at a time when desirable recruits were scarce and superannua-

tion was probably suspended (i. 19, ix. 3).

⁸ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 37. 1, (*τῶν νόμων*) *ὁ μὲν εἰς αὐτοκράτορας ἐποίησε τοὺς τριάκοντα, τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποκτείνει τοὺς μὴ τοῦ καταλόγου μετέχοντας τῶν τρισχιλίων*. Xenophon, II. iii. 51, *ἔστι δὲ ἐν τοῖς καινοῖς νόμοις τῶν μὲν ἐν τοῖς τρισχιλίοις ὄντων μηδένα ἀποθνήσκειν ἀνευ τῆς ὑμετέρας ψήφου, τῶν δ' ἔξω τοῦ καταλόγου κυρίους εἶναι τοὺς τριάκοντα θανατοῦν*. 52, *ὅν περ νόμον οὗτοι ἔγραψαν περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ*.

⁹ Xenophon, II. iii. 48, puts into the mouth of Theramenes the defence of the constitution *τὸ μέντοι σὺν τοῖς δυναμένοις καὶ μεθ' ἱππῶν καὶ μετ' ἀσπίδων ὠφελεῖν διὰ τούτων τὴν πολιτείαν πρὸςθεν ἀριστον ἡγούμενη εἶναι καὶ νῦν οὐ μεταβάλλομαι*. Plato, *Leg.* 753b, gives votes in the election of magistrates to all *ὁπόσοι περ ἂν ὅπλα ἱππικὰ ἢ πεζικὰ τιθώμενοι καὶ πολέμου κεκοινωνήκωσιν ἐν ταῖς σφετέραις αὐτῶν τῆς ἡλικίας δυνάμεσιν*.

¹ Aristotle pp. 25-6.

² G.G. 1

a quadripartite structure. May not Theramenes have regarded it as a temporary makeshift and contemplated its extension on the pattern of the constitution designed for the Five thousand? The increase in the number of the *κατὰ δήμους δικασταί* from 30 to 40, which Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 53. 1) dates from the oligarchy of the Thirty, may be significant and perhaps be taken as an indication or survival of his intention. The way to such an extension was plain enough; it could be simply effected by the union of the governments of Athens and the Piraeus. The Ten who ruled in the Piraeus appear to have been established, perhaps by Lysander, independently of the Thirty, who adopted them, not as subordinates, but as colleagues or associates.¹ Their eventual incorporation would turn the Thirty into a Forty, and if there were not already a Hundred and a Thousand in the Piraeus, these could be enrolled, so that the Forty would be supported by a Council of Four hundred *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια* and the citizens *ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ* would become Five thousand, composed of the Three thousand, the Thousand of the Piraeus, and the thousand Cavaliers.

Whatever may have been Theramenes' intentions, the constitution of Dracontides may reflect some light on the constitution of the Five thousand recorded in Aristotle's chapters *Ath. Pol.* 30 and 31, which (as Beloch² demonstrated) are complementary, each to the other. It suggests that the fifth thousand in the catalogue of the Five thousand consisted of the Cavaliers, a Junior division under 30 years of age; that the four *βουλαι* were four Thousands; that these were represented in each year by four Hundreds, one Hundred from each, who constituted the Executive Council; that the four Hundreds with their respective four Thousands took turns in the administration within the period of each year; that the ten *αὐτοκράτορες* to hold office for the first year of the new régime are in name perhaps *στρατηγοί*, but in fact decarchs who supersede them, like the Tens of the Thirty.

A cursory survey of the constitution of the Five thousand will show that these suggestions are compatible with it. It presents, to be sure, some obscure problems; we seem to assist at the planning of a new State; the draughtsmanship of the documents is lamentable, and gives the impression that they are the products of far from unanimous meetings, dealing at once with permanent legislation and a present emergency, where motions and amendments were adopted as they occurred, *ἀπροβούλευτα* and expressed in phraseology perhaps perspicuous to those who had long discussed the matter but difficult for us to interpret; even the fundamental term of *οἱ πεντακισχίλιοι* appears to be still indefinite and provisional, a form void of personal content (although in practice *οἱ ὅπλα παρεχόμενοι* supplied it), and that is doubtless a reason, besides the political, why precise numbers are eschewed in chapter 30, which must belong to an earlier stage of the construction than chapter 31. We gather however (*Ath. Pol.* 30. 2) that the qualified citizens over the age of 30 are to be members of the Council *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*, that is to say in succession, some one year, some another (cf. *ἐκ τῶν ἀεὶ βουλευόντων* and *μὴ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς*). For the purpose of their future participation in the annual acting Council they are to be organized in four plenary Councils: 30. 3, *βουλὰς ποιῆσαι τέτταρας ἐκ τῆς ἡλικίας τῆς εἰρημένης εἰς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον*; but in each year they are to be represented by a quota appointed by lot: *τούτων τὸ λαχὸν μέρος βουλευεῖν . . . καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλευεῖν*. The word *τούτων* I take to be masculine, for it comprises *τοὺς ἄλλους* (not *τὰς ἄλλας*) in the next clause, and to refer to the members of the four *βουλαι*, which are conceived as though already constituted;³ compare *τούτων* in 30. 2, which refers, not to the whole body of citizens over 30 years of age, but to the smaller annual Council (*τῶν ἀεὶ βουλευόντων*) intended but not yet in existence. Accordingly I understand *τὸ λαχὸν μέρος* to mean, not one of the four *βουλαι* (as the following *τέτταρα μέρη* might tempt us to suppose),

¹ Aristot. *Ath. Pol.* 35. 1. C.Q. XXXII. 1938, pp. 25-6.

² So *τούτων* becomes, in thought, *τῶν ἐν ἐκάστῃ τῇ βουλῇ*.

³ G.G.² II. ii. pp. 311-324.

but, by implication and in effect, a fraction of each of the four. This interpretation is certified by the words which continue and complete the sentence: *νεῖμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πρὸς τὴν λήξιν ἐκάστην*; 'the others', those who are not included in the allotted quota, are to be apportioned 'to each lot'. *Τὴν λήξιν* must carry on the sense of *τὸ λαχὼν μέρος*, but *ἐκάστην* indicates that *τὸ λαχὼν μέρος* is a single instance which has to be repeated or multiplied into a plurality of *λήξεις*. The next sentence shows that these are to be four in number; it is a parenthetic instruction to the hundred Commissioners to carry out the preceding clause by distributing themselves and 'the others' into four equal groups and allotting (*διακληρώσαι*) them to the *λήξεις*; and we find in the next chapter (31. 3) the groups themselves called *τὰς τέτταρας λήξεις*, a description doubly justified by their assignment by lot to aliquot parts chosen by lot, and exactly paralleled by the name *βουλή*, which they share with the annual Council.

But an obvious flaw threatens to throw the whole machine out of gear. On the one hand the acting Council is to be a quota selected by lot out of the members of the four groups; on the other hand the groups are to be formed on the basis of that Council by attaching to each of its four component sections a quarter of the other citizens who are not included in it. We are thus posed with the old puzzle, which of the two came first, the egg or the hen? As neither the Council nor the groups yet existed the Athenians had to decide the urgent practical questions whether the one or the others should be created first, and how. Chapter 31 gives their solution of the problem. It was simpler and quicker to create the requisite Council by special decree than to wait for the definitive catalogue of the Five thousand, which would, in spite (or because) of the zeal of Polystratus¹ and his colleagues, be a long and (if the Tribes were to be equally represented) a very complicated task. A Council consisting, *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*, of 400 members, 40 from each Tribe, was to be appointed *ἐν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ, ῥηοῦς ἡσ vice, ἐκ προκρίτων οὓς ἂν ἔλυνται οἱ φυλῆται τῶν ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων*. The *πρόκριτοι* are obviously a substitute for the four groups out of which the Council contemplated in chapter 30 was to be chosen; and if we may assume that ten candidates were put forward for each seat, the total number of *πρόκριτοι* would be four thousand. The natural inference is that the four groups were to be four Thousands. Similarly the 40 Councillors from each of the ten Tribes seem to imply ten Councillors from each Tribe in four sections of the Council of 400, which, applied to the Council of chapter 30, would give a Hundred for each *λαχὼν μέρος*. There is no reason to believe that this inaugural Council of chapter 31 differs from the Council of chapter 30 in any point except that it is drawn (by lot presumably) from the 4,000 *πρόκριτοι* elected by the *φυλῆται* instead of from the four groups; the sole purpose of the deviation is to supply the lack of the groups, which could not yet be constituted, but were presupposed by the procedure laid down *εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα χρόνον*. That the attention of the legislators was directed upon this point in particular is also clear from the last sentence of chapter 31; the substituted procedure entailed the difficulty that the four hundred members of the first Council would be outside the four groups when these were constituted by the method prescribed, and special provision had to be made to ensure their inclusion at the end of their term of office; this amendment is duly appended in the last clause of the decree, *εἰς δὲ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον, ἵνα νεμηθῶσιν οἱ τετρακόσιοι εἰς τὰς τέτταρας λήξεις, ὅταν τοῖς πρώτοις² γίγνηται μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βουλευεῖν, διανεμάντων αὐτοῖς οἱ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες*.

It appears therefore that the above suggestions, that the four *βουλαί* were to be four Thousands and the annual Council was to consist of four Hundreds, are borne

¹ Lys. XX. 13.

² I read *πρωτοῖς* (not *αστοῖς*) in the photographic facsimile of the papyrus; the scribe has

written *πρωτοῖς* and inserted the *ρ* above the *π*, through which its tail passes.

¹ Lex. Suidas, s. et al.

² Cf. A. of usurpation, menes ag. γὰρ δι' αὐτὴν πεντακισχ.

³ Ath.

out by the documents. As they account for those of the Five thousand over 30 years of age to the number of 4,000, the suggestion that the Cavaliers formed the fifth Thousand becomes very probable. The rotation of the *λήξεις* is supported by the parallel of the four Councils of the Boeotians *κατὰ μέρος ἐκάστη προκαθήμενη καὶ προβουλευούσα*, and seems to be implied by the stress laid upon their equality and allotment and their distribution into four, which was no doubt intended to reproduce the scheme ascribed to the *πάτριος πολιτεία* and quoted by lexicographers and scholiasts from the lost chapters of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians*, *φύλας δὲ αὐτῶν συννεμεῖσθαι δ', ἀπομιμησαμένων τὰς ἐν τοῖς ἐνιαυτοῖς ὥρας*.¹ The relation between the Hundreds and the Thousands is not defined, but it is probable that the Hundreds were designed to act as *πρωτάνεις* for the Thousands in much the same way as the 50 *πρωτάνεις* for the normal Council of 500.² The precedent of the four seasons in the 'ancestral constitution', and the ordinance *καὶ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν βουλευεῖν* (30. 3), and the whole tenour of the decrees, indicate that the rotation was to be within the compass of each year, and not in a cycle of four years, which would be an extremely inconvenient, indeed impracticable, arrangement. The analogy between the ten *αὐτοκράτορες* and the Tens of the Thirty needs no demonstration, but it may be added that the second hipparch and the taxiarchs are absent from our records of the government of the Thirty as from the temporary provisions in chapter 31.

Many readers of Aristotle's treatise must have asked the question whether the constitution ascribed to Draco (*Ath. Pol.* 4) may not be really the constitution of Dracontides, thrown back a couple of centuries by some mutilation or abbreviation of the name. Since J. W. Headlam (*C.R.* V. 1891, pp. 166-8) pointed out its character few would deny that it belongs to the same period and the same school of political thought; but beyond that general affinity and the common element in the names and the appropriate reference to the functions of the Areopagus I see no evidence of connection between the two, whereas the allusion (4. 3) to the *τέλη* raises doubts and the Council of 400,³ inconsistent with Dracontides' constitution if the testimony of Lysias be accepted, is a definite discrepancy. Other reformers in like case have invested their proposals with the prestige of a venerated lawgiver of a remote antiquity, a Lycurgus or a Moses; when Cleon in Aristophanes' comedy (*Eq.*, 1002, *seqq.*), seeking to impress Demos, produces oracles of Bacis, the sausage-seller outdoes him with oracles of Glanis, an elder brother of Bacis; so, when the democrats quoted the Magna Charta of Solon (cf. *Aristot. Pol.* 1273b), it would be an obvious retort for their opponents to invoke the even more ancestral authority of Draco; and if we are to play with names, there is an alternative road for speculative ingenuity in *Ἀρίσταιχος* (*Ath. Pol.* 4. 1) and *Ἀριστόμαχος* (32. 1).⁴

It may be taken for granted that Theramenes and his colleagues in framing the constitution of Dracontides, as in framing the constitution of the Five thousand (cf. Cleitophon's rider, *Ath. Pol.* 29. 3, and 34. 3), did their best to make them as like as possible to the ancestral model, or what they believed to be such. It would be interesting to study the *πάτριος πολιτεία* in relation to their interpretations and adaptations, but the subject is too big for the present occasion, and I confine my comments to two points. (1) The scheme preserved by lexicographers and scholiasts from the lost early chapters of Aristotle's *Constitution of the Athenians* assigns

¹ Lex. Demosth. *Patm.* s.v. *γεννήται*. Cf. Suidas, s.v. *γεννήται*; Schol. Plato *Phileb.* 30d; et al.

² Cf. *Aristot. Ath. Pol.* 29. 5, and the charge of usurpation made by Aristocrates and Theramenes against The Four hundred (33. 2), *ἅπαντα γὰρ δι' αὐτῶν ἐπαρττον, οὐδὲν ἐπαφέροντες τοῖς πεντακισχιλίοις*.

³ *Ath. Pol.* 4. 3, *βουλευεῖν δὲ τετρακοσίους κατ'*

ἐνιαυτὸν τοὺς λαχόντας ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας, where B. Lakon's emendation of the MS *καὶ ἐνα τοὺς* seems to me convincing; cf. 30. 2, 31. 1.

⁴ The transposition of letters or syllables in similar names is familiar; here are a few examples from the Archons-list — *Νικόδημος* or *-μήδης*, *Ἀμφίων* or *Ἀμφέσιων*, *Ξένος* or *Ἐξάινετος*, *Δυσίκητος* or *-κίνητος*.

30 *ἄνδρες*, *patresfamilias*, to each *γένος*. The clue to this number is to be found, I suggest, in the 30 years, from their 30th to 60th, during which the fully privileged citizens remained on the catalogue *τῶν ὅπλα παρεχομένων*. The *γεννήται* are regarded as a generation of men distributed evenly through the list, one in each year. (2) The scheme is based on the principle of rotation in office; the four Tribes have each their season, the twelve Phratries each their month, the 360 Gentes their day apiece in a year of 360 days, and each head of a household has his own day once in his generation of 30 years. Theramenes and his colleagues are legislating in 411 for half the total number in the scheme, but the citizen is allowed two turns on the Council, *βουλευῆσαι δῖς*, as the normal constitution had established the rule (*Ath. Pol.* 31. 3, 62. 3). $360 \times 30 = 10800 = (5000 + 400) \times 2$. True, they are instituting a Council of 400, not 360, but if they contemplated eventually four rotary Tens, in accordance with the project above tentatively ascribed to Theramenes in 404 B.C., and these Tens were to be included in the 400, the ordinary members of the Council would number 360, as the scheme requires.

J. A. R. MUNRO.

LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD

THE PSEUDO-PLATONIC SOCRATES.

DISCUSSION on the Platonic Socrates in relation to the historic Socrates has to some extent subsided in recent years. The older tradition looks like maintaining itself. But the question remains a provocative one, and further light on it would be welcome. It is some years, indeed, since Professor Field¹ showed reason to doubt whether any further light will now be found, and advised reliance on the main line of tradition, through Aristotle, in the belief that we cannot in any case reach behind it.

I do not profess to offer any fresh discoveries on this subject. But it seemed to me worth while, and of some interest, to explore a field which has not (I think) been specially considered in this connection—the pseudo-Platonic dialogues. Without ignoring differences of opinion on the question of authenticity, I take leave to include in the present inquiry *all* those dialogues upon whose genuineness any serious doubt may be cast. (Several of the more interesting for our purpose are admittedly spurious and of fairly late date.) The question is, then, whether these dialogues or any of them have, in their presentation of the person and utterances of Socrates, anything to contribute to the Socratic tradition.

While these works differ considerably in style and treatment, it may be noted at the outset that (with only one or two exceptions) they deal with what may by distinction be called Socratic rather than Platonic topics. They tend to discuss simple ethical questions; in several the Socratic method is imitated or criticized; in some, the *δαιμόνιον σημεῖον* is introduced; in several again the Socratic insistence on the claims and importance of *ψυχή* is re-emphasized, but with little or no analysis. One exception to this generalization about their Socratic content is the *Hippias Major*, which contains evident references to the *παρουσία*-form of the Theory of Ideas as presented in the *Phaedo*. Another is, perhaps, the obviously later *Axiochus*, in which the theme of immortality is treated in a manner which recalls the myths of Plato's middle period.

Postponing further discussion of subject-matter, we may consider first the way in which the actual personality of Socrates, his attitude and his style of utterance, is represented in these dialogues. It is natural to begin with those which are probably of the Platonic period and are by some defended as genuine.

The *Ion* need not detain us. Socrates here is not distinguishable in personality from the Socrates of the shorter genuine dialogues; and indeed the work may well be by Plato himself.

The *Clitophon* (which Professor Grube² considers genuine) contains only a few words spoken by Socrates. The attack on his method which occupies nearly the whole space assumes the Socrates familiar to us from early Platonic works.

In the *Menexenus*, Socrates is urbane and playful in the conversational passages, but hardly beyond 'Socratic' limits. The problem raised by the main content of the dialogue must be considered later.

The *First Alcibiades* represents Socrates as both *ἐπαστής* and teacher of Alcibiades; it is an able exposition of the Socratic method of *ἐλεγχος* and induction. The personality of Socrates is kindly, bracing and encouraging, again drawn on familiar lines.

The Socrates of the *Hippias Minor* is somewhat similarly depicted; he is a

¹ *C.Q.* 1923-1925.

² *Class. Phil.* 1931.

shrewd debater (carrying his usual methods to a *reductio ad absurdum*), mildly rallying Hippias but expressing *εἰρωνεία* as to his own powers.

In the *Hippias Major* (also defended by Grube¹ and others) the character is vigorously drawn. Socrates is a match in dialectic for the dogmatic and vain Hippias, but still expresses *εἰρωνεία* at the close of the argument. He makes odd (and hardly Platonic) reference to an unnamed critic (*τις*), who is mentioned at intervals during the argument and in the end appears to be a disguise for Socrates himself (304d, *καὶ γὰρ μοι τυγχάνει ἐγγύτατα γένους ὢν καὶ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ οἰκῶν*). There is no suggestion here of the *δαμόνιον*. The style and language of this dialogue show some curious features, especially a fondness for colloquial and for mock-tragic terms; these are used in common by *both* the speakers, and must therefore be explained by the writer's idiosyncrasy rather than by any actual tradition regarding either Hippias or Socrates himself. If Socrates here sometimes transgresses the Platonic norm of urbanity, this again is part of the general tone of the dialogue.

The *Erastae* gives a pleasant characterization of Socrates; in the manner of the *Lysis* and the *Charmides*, he is here again the admirer and the adviser of youth. The style he uses is simple and lively, particularly at the opening, and the argument proceeds on usual lines except for one or two abrupt transitions. The one incongruity in Socrates, here, is the note of complacency on which he is made to end. 139a, *εἰπόντος δ' ἐμοῦ ταῦτα ὁ μὲν σοφὸς αἰσχυρθεὶς τοῖς προειρημένοις ἐσίγησεν, ὁ δὲ ἀμαθὴς ἔφη ἐκείνως εἶναι· καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἐπήνεσαν τὰ εἰρημένα*. This passage certainly suggests an imitator, though he is probably an early one.

The *Second Alcibiades* represents Socrates as true to type, both in his insistence on points of logic and in his advice on religious observance. He shows a tendency to take sole charge of the discussion, and to make long speeches, which becomes more marked in the spurious works of a later date.

It was natural that in process of time Socrates should become, for these imitators, less of a personality and more of a *μηχανή* for conveying doctrine. The *Minos* and the *Hipparchus* are alike in exhibiting this tendency. Each represents Socrates as conversing with an unnamed *ἑταῖρος*. In each, his manner is heavy and didactic without light relief, and his style alternates between awkward abruptness in dialogue and long and prosy narrative. Nothing better can be said of the Socrates represented in the brief *περὶ δικαίου* and *περὶ ἀρετῆς* and in the *Sisyphus*. In the *Eryxias*, again, which Mr. Eichholtz² places early in the third century B.C. and regards as an Academic product, Socrates is portrayed as dour and sarcastic, and there is no byplay or relief amid the 'arid dialectic' of the argument.

The Socrates of the *Theages* is drawn in more classic line; he is pleasant and on occasion playful, humanly interested in the young Theages, natural in the give-and-take of conversation. But as the dialogue proceeds he becomes un-Socratically self-important in describing the miraculous power of his *δαμόνιον*. This point must be considered later.

In the *Axiochus*, finally, Socrates is sympathetic, modest, protreptic, not at all un-Socratic in temper, though extremely eclectic in the doctrines he is made to put forward. While the content of the mythical passages suggests some analogy with the middle-Platonic Socrates, the utterance here is sober by comparison; and if Platonic, he is Platonic only at intervals. With sound instinct the writer assigns to him, at the close of the exposition, words which partly recall the *Apology*. 372a, *ψυχὴ ἅπανα ἀθάνατος, ἥ δὲ ἐκ τοῦδε τοῦ χωρίου μετασταθεῖσα καὶ ἄλυστος· ὥστε ἢ κάτω ἢ ἄνω εὐδαιμονεῖν σε δεῖ, βεβιωκότα εἰσεβῶς*.

Thus the actual portrayal of the figure of Socrates, in these spurious works, is on the whole found to recall the characterization of Plato's early period. The personality may become fainter as time goes on, but it retains much that is familiar.

¹ C.Q. 1926.

² C.Q. 1935.

The ex-
writer's
element

As
several
to supp
Platonic
all illu
the *Chit*
criticism
directed
earliest
makes h
special k

An
observin
καὶ φλν
astronom
such sub
that adm
in partic
πολυμαθ
seems to
πολυμαθ
the outlo
lie either
rather th

The
is here
recites;
began in
surveys
defence
against I
is introdu
otherwise
'freakish
nothing t
the auda
indeed, c
But the t
very bold
Platonic
easier on
on the vi
it, we ma
up Socra

The
except th
works wh
Arising fr

The exuberance of Socrates in the *Hippias Major* is exceptional and a mark of the writer's own style; the mythical tendency he shows in the *Axiochus* is mixed with elements that are in any case not Platonic.

As regards the content of these dialogues, it has already been indicated that several are merely exercises in Socratic debate on traditional lines. So far, they go to support the view that the tradition among Plato's imitators was that of the early-Platonic or 'historic' Socrates. The *First Alcibiades*, *Hippias Minor*, *Erastae*, *Ion* all illustrate this type of exercise at its best, with Socrates leading the argument. In the *Chitophon*, the tables are neatly turned and Socrates is subjected to a vigorous criticism of his method of *ἐλεγχος* and *ἀπορία*—a criticism which is fairly obviously directed upon *Republic* I. It is noteworthy that in these, the best and probably earliest of the imitations, Socrates is represented as using his *εἰωθνία εἰρωνεία*. He makes here none of the pretensions, which elsewhere he is found developing, to special knowledge or inspiration.

An interesting point arises in the *Erastae*. The dialogue opens with Socrates observing two lads who, as the *ἐραστής* of one remarks, *ἀδολεσχούσι περὶ τῶν μετεώρων καὶ φλυνροῦσι φιλοσοφούντες* (132b). They are poring over some geometrical and astronomical diagrams. As the argument develops, there is no further mention of such subjects as part of the domain of philosophy. The philosopher, as master of that administrative art which is essentially *one*, is contrasted with those who specialize in particular *τέχναι*. The conclusion is (139a) πολλοῦ ἄρα δεῖ . . . τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν πολυμαθία τε εἶναι καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰς τέχνας πραγματεία. The argument here certainly seems to exclude by implication the mathematical studies, as well as other sorts of *πολυμαθία*, from the field of philosophy as Socrates understands it. Here is, in fact, the outlook of the 'historic', not of the 'Platonic' Socrates. The explanation must lie either in very early date or in conscious following of that tradition about Socrates rather than of the character in its Platonic development.

The problem of the *Menexenus* may have some bearing on our inquiry. Socrates is here represented as having heard from Aspasia the funeral oration which he recites; it was, he says, composed for the dead in the Corinthian War. That war began in 395; Socrates goes indeed further along the path of anachronism and surveys the peace made in 387. Professor Taylor,¹ in his brilliant analysis and defence of the dialogue, takes it to be a satirization of patriotic oratory, directed against Isocrates. He argues that the glaring anachronism about the funeral speech is introduced to give warning of the satiric purpose of the whole work, which might otherwise be missed. The anachronism is perpetrated, he says, in a vein of 'freakish' humour and to make it clear that Socrates is here 'a mere puppet' and has nothing to do with the Socrates of fact. He concludes that no pupil would have had the audacity to do this thing; only Plato, 'once and in an unhappy moment' indeed, could have taken such a liberty. This solution of the difficulty is ingenious. But the theory of such a travesty of the normal setting of Socrates is singular and very bold as coming from one who upholds the close faithfulness, elsewhere, of the Platonic portrait. If we are to believe that Plato wrote the *Menexenus*, it is surely easier on the theory that elsewhere too he took some liberties with his Socrates than on the view that only here he breaks away from historicity. If Plato did not write it, we may well suppose that the author took for granted such a practice of writing-up Socrates and improved on it for his own impish purpose.

The *Hippias Major* presents a special problem of another kind. It is (if we except the *Axiochus* as obviously late and eclectic in content) the only one of these works which has some clear association with the doctrines of Plato's maturity. Arising from the Socratic search for a definition of τὸ καλόν, we find a series of quasi-

¹ Plato, 41 ff.

metaphysical statements which connect closely with the *παρουσία*-theory of the *Phaedo* and appear to lead on to the criticism in the *Parmenides*, and also a theory of pleasure which marks a stage, in analysis, between the *Gorgias* and the *Philebus*. (I still believe that these features in the dialogue, as well as its general style and atmosphere, are best explained on the theory that it is the work of a young student of the Academy writing in Plato's lifetime.)

In this dialogue the implication does seem to be that Socrates represents theories closely comparable to those expressed in some of the middle-Platonic works. On the whole, the Socrates of the *Hippias Major* looks like a Platonic Socrates. But this statement has to be qualified. In spite of frequent verbal resemblances to the *Phaedo* and the *Republic* especially, it is only one part of the doctrine of those dialogues that is here taken up and expounded after a fashion. The logical aspect of the earlier Theory of Ideas is the writer's chief interest; that is what he attaches to his Socrates. We find the formula τὸ καλὸν τὰ καλὰ καλὰ, presumably taken from the *Phaedo*, and applied to other instances; we find also puzzles about the verbs προσγενέσθαι and παραγενέσθαι as used of the εἶδος. This is one side of the *Phaedo* theory; of the other, we find no trace. There is no suggestion of the παράδειγμα relationship—a strange omission in dealing with τὸ καλόν, that εἶδος which above others lends itself to such a concept. The word οὐσία is used in a confused way, once at least of a logical attribute and never in the transcendent sense which Plato attaches to it when once his metaphysical theory is formed. Further, there is in this dialogue no suggestion of that poetic and mystical approach to metaphysics which is characteristic of Plato's middle period.

Thus the Socrates of the *Hippias Major* is, in a measure, Socratic rather than Platonic. But the dialogue is admittedly one of the most perplexing, as it is perhaps the most interesting, of the group.

The content of the *Axiochus* may now be considered in more detail in connection with this question of Platonic theory. The dialogue is a discussion on death. The author makes Socrates the spokesman of a variety of theories of later date (in particular the Epicurean doctrine, ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς κτλ., is clearly assumed and expounded at 365d and 369b), and at the same time goes out of his way to be anachronistic by letting him refer to the case (as having occurred πρῶην) of the Ten Generals (368d, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἐπηρόμην τὴν γνώμην). Prodicus, again, is mentioned as the teacher of Socrates. Constrained to be Epicurean by turns, Socrates is nobly inconsistent, and the materialist doctrine is passed over in favour of Orphic and Platonic views, which are expounded in some fine and elevated passages. Socrates offers finally a mythical λόγος (371a) which he has heard from a Persian sage, Gobryes. This is obviously in imitation of the *Gorgias* and of *Republic* X; the myth itself contains an interesting mixture of eschatological matter. As has been already mentioned, the exposition ends on a semi-Socratic note; and in the closing interchange of quiet and even casual remarks we have, perhaps, a suggestion of the tradition of the *Phaedo* and of tragedy.

Confused as it is in doctrine, the *Axiochus* gathers up and emphasizes one theme which recurs in these pseudo-Platonic works—the association of Socrates with a concern about the welfare of ψυχή. The soul is conceived as the conscious personality, even here not much analysed, but simply contrasted with body as being the essential and the enduring part. In this interest shown by Socrates, and the general simplicity with which the question is treated, the writers seem to be on safe historic ground.

It remains to consider a point of special interest—the development, through two of these dialogues in particular, of a supernatural view of the δαιμόνιον σημεῖον. In the genuine works this sign has certain clear characteristics. It is θεῖον τι καὶ δαιμόνιον (*Ap.* 31d), τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον (40b), τὸ σημεῖον (41d). It has been with

Socrates
by Socr
(31d);
allow a
It can i
feeling,

Xen
times ad
I. 4, καὶ
προσημα
defends
which in
Xenopho
thunder.

It is
the δαιμό
ing of th
by a mys
πέισση.
of the rel

The
the dialo
σοι εἶποι
δὴ καὶ π
105e, οὐκ
έῳσει, the
new term
and while
the *Apolo*
familiar s

It ma
dialogues
In contr
mission, a
First Alc
the chang
the *Evast*
obscuring
making hi
the *Hippa*
line of He

It is
Socrates.
obtain σοφ
nature an
dialogue, a
the langua
ἀρξάμενον
πράττειν, τ
is assigned
ταῦτον τοῦ
of his frien
Instant

Socrates from his youth, *φωνή τις γιγνομένη* (31d)—a 'voice' heard, or apprehended, by Socrates alone. Its advice is negative, *ἀεὶ ἀποτρέπει με . . . προτρέπει δὲ οὐδέποτε* (31d); and its message is for Socrates himself. Where now and then it is said to allow a course of action (as at *Theaet.* 151a), this may imply no more than its silence. It can in fact be fairly explained, in Plato's writings, as a purely subjective inward feeling, of the nature of a strong inhibition.

Xenophon makes the *δαιμόνιον σημεῖον* somewhat more positive; it does sometimes advise rather than dissuade, and for others besides Socrates himself. *Mem.* i. 1. 4, *καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν συνόντων προηγόρευε τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ δαιμονίου προσημαίνοντος*. It may be conceived by Xenophon as an audible message; thus he defends Socrates' use of it by appealing (*Mem.* i. 1. 3) to the general belief in omens which include *φῆμαι*. This suggestion of audibility is further developed in the Xenophontic *Apology*, where the sign is compared (12) to the cries of birds and to thunder.

It is one possible reason for rejecting the *First Alcibiades* that in this dialogue the *δαιμόνιον* seems to be taking on a different character. At the rather abrupt opening of the conversation, Socrates explains his hitherto not conversing with Alcibiades by a mystifying reference (103a) to *τι δαιμόνιον ἐναντίωμα, οὗ σὺ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ὕστερον πείσῃ*. The word *ἐναντίωμα* suggests the Platonic conception, but the general tone of the reference is of a different kind; it is less modest, more ceremonious.

The divine monitor is later mentioned (105d ff.) as *ὁ θεός*. The whole tone of the dialogue is indeed admonitory, and Socrates has already said to Alcibiades *εἴ τις σοι εἰποι θεῶν, . . .* (105a). But in reference to the sign the phrase is definite—105d, *δὲ δὴ καὶ πάλοι οἶομαί με τὸν θεὸν οὐκ ἔαν διαλέγεσθαί σοι, ὃν ἐγὼ περιέμενον ὀπῆνικα ἔασαι*. 105e, *οὐκ εἴα ὁ θεὸς διαλέγεσθαι . . . νῦν δὲ ἐφῆκε*. While *ἐφῆκε* is more positive than *ἔασαι*, the admonition seems to be still regarded as mainly negative. But *ὁ θεός* is a new term for the inner voice (the parallel with the opening phrase at 103a is obvious); and while it may mean no more than is implied by the phrase *τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον* in the *Apology*, it suggests rather a new conception of the *δαιμόνιον* as an indwelling familiar spirit.

It may be remarked here that there seems to be no reference, in the spurious dialogues, to the Delphic oracle, or explicitly to Apollo as the patron god of Socrates. In contrast to the *εἰρηνεία* which is associated with his interpretation of his Delphic mission, and which survives in some of these works, we find taking shape in the *First Alcibiades* the conception of a Socrates who is a superior being. A symptom of the changing view is seen in the passage of un-Socratic complacency at the end of the *Erastae* (139a), which has been already quoted. This suggests not merely an obscuring of the original character of Socrates, but also a development towards making him both a layer-down of the law in formal instruction (as in the *Eryxias* or the *Hipparchus*) and also the divinely endowed magician which he becomes in one line of Hellenistic tradition.

It is the *Theages* which first defines this tradition of a supernatural power in Socrates. After discussion in which the young Theages explains his desire to obtain *σοφία* for purposes of rule, Socrates enters upon a detailed description of the nature and power of his *δαιμόνιον*. This topic is continued to the end of the dialogue, and is apparently its main motive. The first reference to the sign recalls the language of the *Apology*. 128d, *ἔστι γάρ τι θεία μοῖρα παρεπόμενον ἐμοὶ ἐκ παιδὸς ἀρξάμενον δαιμόνιον. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο φωνή, ἢ ὅταν γένηται αἰεὶ μοι σημαίνει, ὃ ἂν μέλλω πράττειν, τούτου ἀποτροπὴν, προτρέπει δὲ οὐδέποτε*. But immediately a further function is assigned to the voice—*καὶ ἔαν τις μοι τῶν φίλων ἀνακοινῶται καὶ γένηται ἢ φωνή, ταῦτόν τοῦτο, ἀποτρέπει καὶ οὐκ ἔφ' πράττειν*. The *δαιμόνιον* of Socrates is at the service of his friends also.

Instances are given. Charmides told Socrates he intended to train for the

Nemean races. The voice at once occurred, and Socrates said, λέγοντός σου μεταξὺ γέγονέ μοι ἡ φωνή ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου· ἀλλὰ μὴ ἄσκει (128e). Charmides persisted; and it is implied that the result was unfortunate. A dramatic story follows, introduced by the words of Timarchus on his way to die—ἐρχομαι ἀποθανοῦμενος νυνί, διότι Σωκράτει οὐκ ἤθελον πείθεσθαι (129a). Timarchus and a friend purposed a murder; no one else knew the plot. Twice, as they rose to leave the συμπόσιον, Socrates heard the voice (note that in this case he is ignorant of its bearing) and warned Timarchus not to go. The third time he evaded Socrates; the crime was committed, and for it he was sentenced to death.

Socrates further mentions, in connection with the Sicilian campaign, ἃ ἐγὼ ἔλεγον περὶ τῆς διαφθορᾶς τοῦ στρατοπέδου (129d). This vague reference may imply another development; Socrates' power of divination gives general warning that a policy will lead to disaster. Again, the sign has warned him to fear for the safety of Sannio, who has departed on an expedition; here the point is not a deterrent for Sannio, but foreknowledge of his fate.

Another function of the δαιμόνιον is now expounded, and a remarkable one. Socrates says it exercises an influence over his converse with other persons. Even where it does not forbid, in some cases the interlocutor obtains no benefit; other persons it positively assists—οἷς δ' ἂν συλλάβηται τῆς συνοσίας ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου δύναμις. . . . (129e). Such people make rapid progress (ἐπιδιδόσιν), in argument, by implication (ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, 130c). With some the benefit is lasting; others, when parted from Socrates, lapse into mediocrity. The younger Aristides experienced this, when obliged to go away on naval service. He also told Socrates (as ἄπιστον μὲν νῆ τοῖς θεοῖς, ἀληθὲς δέ, 130d) that he learnt nothing from him, but made progress whenever he was with him. The element of wonder is growing. Even to be in the same house with Socrates benefited Aristides; he made more progress when in the same room, more still when looking at Socrates, most of all when touching him. So Socrates is here fully endowed with a supernatural influence; and it appears, strangely, to be attached not so much to his ψυχή as to his bodily frame. This is far removed from that compelling personal power described by Alcibiades in the *Symposium*.

Theages proposes to try the pleasure of the δαιμόνιον, and if necessary to conciliate it εὐχαισὶ τε καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἄλλῃ ὅτῃ ἂν οἱ μάντις ἐξηγῶνται (131a). This may be an imitation of Plato's half-playful style; in the present context it seems more likely to be seriously meant.

Thus in the *Theages* the stage is set for the ἀποθείωσις of Socrates later consummated in Hellenistic treatises—the *de Deo Socratis* of Apuleius, the pseudo-Plutarchian *de Genio Socratis*, the *τί τὸ δαιμόνιον Σωκράτους* of Maximus of Tyre. These writers enhance the marvel, and point the moral; Socrates' divine visitations were, they say, the unique reward of his surpassing purity of soul.

This development of the Socratic tradition, through the *Theages*, appears to be the most striking positive feature of the pseudo-Platonic portrait. It will be noted that the conception of the δαιμόνιον σημεῖον is in the strict sense Socratic, as deriving from the *Apology* and from Xenophon. There is, on the other hand, no suggestion in these dialogues of Socrates' claim to μαιεντική. This rôle, an aspect in fact of his εἰρωνεία, has become traditional from its treatment in the *Theaetetus* (149a etc.). Its absence from the spurious as well as from the earlier Platonic works may perhaps support the view that it is an invention of Plato and not attributable to Socrates himself.

The Socrates of the pseudo-Platonic dialogues is, we find, on the whole Socratic rather than Platonic, both in characterization and in content of thought. Whether we assign all these works to independent writers, or postulate for the earlier group

a 'school'
same.
Platonic
enhancing
Plato's o

BEDFORD

NOT
I am ind
discussion

a 'school' of imitators within the Academy, their view of Socrates is much the same. They tend to perpetuate the earlier and simpler portrait; and the pseudo-Platonic field gives little or no ground for superseding the old tradition, or for enhancing the personality and expanding the doctrine of Socrates to the scale of Plato's own achievement.

DOROTHY TARRANT.

BEDFORD COLLEGE, LONDON.

NOTE.—This article is based on a paper read to the B Club at Cambridge; and I am indebted to members of that society for several points made in the course of discussion.

PHILODEMUS ON *ETHOS* IN MUSIC.

THE fragmentary columns of the Fourth Book of Philodemus' *περὶ μουσικῆς* were the first-fruits of Herculaneum, published in 1793, with venturesome reconstructions and learned notes, by the *Academici* of Naples. Fragments of the other books occur in four volumes of the *Collectio Altera* of 1862-5. A Teubner Text by J. Kemke, a pupil of Bücheler, appeared in 1884, upon which Gomperz made a number of improvements in a pamphlet published in the following year.¹ Otherwise, save for a few pages in H. Abert's *Die Lehre vom Ethos in der griechischen Musik*,² published in 1899, the work has attracted very little attention; which is scarcely surprising in view of the state of the text and the peculiar awkwardness of Philodemus' Greek.

However, writing in 1924, Mr J. D. Denniston made the following pertinent remarks:³ 'Perhaps the most interesting aesthetic observation which has come down to us from the centuries after Aristotle is the assertion of a certain Philodemus of Gadara, an Epicurean who lived in the closing years⁴ of the First Century B.C., that music, by itself, has no power whatever to "imitate" character, or even (a surprising statement) to arouse, intensify or allay emotion. It would be interesting to follow the arguments on which Philodemus bases this violent reaction against the "imitation" theory. But the papyrus discovered at Herculaneum which is our sole authority for the *De Musica*, though intact enough to stimulate curiosity, is too mutilated to satisfy it.' At about the same time Christian Jensen published his important edition of Book V of Philodemus' *περὶ ποιημάτων*. This stimulated Rostagni⁵ and others to an interest in his ideas, and led to the discovery that, on Poetry at least, the Epicureans held aesthetic views remarkable for their soundness and common sense, such indeed as would satisfy most people to-day. In the light of this, it is the object of this article to attempt the task which Mr Denniston, perhaps more prudently, rejected—to examine the fragments of the *περὶ μουσικῆς*, and see if anything can be determined about the basis of Philodemus' views, and about the attitude of the Epicureans to music as a pleasure.

As is well established, Philodemus was not an original thinker, though he has a tone in controversy which is all his own. He may be relying here on Epicurus' lost work *περὶ μουσικῆς* (D.L. X, 28); very probably also on his master, Zeno of Sidon. His chief butt, the Stoic Diogenes of Seleucia, lived a century before him, and he has no reference to Posidonius.⁶ But for simplicity's sake I will refer to the views as though they were his own; that the opinions he attacks were by no means dead is clear from such works as the *περὶ μουσικῆς* of Aristides Quintilianus and of Pseudo-Plutarch. Philodemus' polemical method is to take each saying of his opponent and criticize it, not minding how much he repeats himself; so that we can only

¹ *Zu Philodems Büchern von der Musik*, 1885.

² Pp. 27-37. To this admirable work any student of the subject must be indebted.

³ *Greek Literary Criticism*, p. XIX.

⁴ This should read 'middle', if not 'first half'. Cf. also Abert's *Gesammelte Schriften* (*Die Stellung der Musik in der Antiken Kultur*, 1926);

L. P. Wilkinson, *Philodemus and Poetry*, pp. 146-7 (Greece and Rome, May, 1933).

⁵ Introduction to 'Arte Poetica di Orazio' (1930).

⁶ See J. L. Stocks in *New Chapters in Greek Literature*, First Series, p. 23.

gather h
to be con

In t

In partic
aim is ἡ
incidenta
ώφελῃ,
the ἀπερ
separable

The

Pythagor
the vario
great im
have bee
details, i
oppositio
modified
and not l
ing to wo
a course
their mo
phrases i
and with
character
cation of
Yet he
theorists,
New Mu
view.³ I
well, that
reconstru

The
even dan
fusion of
attributed
col. 29, 1

'Nov
Aristoxen
(μουσικοῦς
(ἀσκήματα
and Simo
musicians
in this cap
extent; a
alike.'

μουσι
music, th
there wer
'musician
distinction
the old s

¹ See Ros

² Tr. H. S

gather his positive views by deduction from scattered passages. Much is bound to be conjecture, but it may be plausible conjecture.

In the *περὶ ποιημάτων* Philodemus attacked the whole classical theory of poetry. In particular, he denied that it has essentially any moral or practical function; its aim is ἡδονή, or ψυχαγωγία. It may of course be useful or improving (ὠφέλιμον) incidentally, but that is unessential; even if it be so, it is not so *qua* poetry (κἂν ὠφελῇ, καθὼ ποιήματ' οὐκ ὠφελεῖ. V, col. 29, l. 17). He also stated that the ἀρετή of poetry comes from a marriage of form and content, which are inseparable.¹

The *περὶ μουσικῆς* is a similar attack on the classical theory of music. The Pythagoreans seem to have been responsible for the first formulation of the idea that the various kinds of music had certain ethical effects. At Athens this received a great impetus from a famous exposition by Damon, the friend of Pericles, said to have been made before the Areopagus. Plato assumed its validity, and discussed its details, in the Third Book of the *Republic* (398-400), and again, this time clearly in opposition to heretics, in the Second Book of the *Laws* (669 ff.). But Aristotle modified the strictly ethical view by giving music a place also in *διαγωγή* (*Pol.* 1339), and not long after him the Peripatetic Aristoxenus (II, 31) gave the following warning to would-be musicians: 'Some consider harmonic a sublime science, and expect a course in it to make them musicians; nay, some even conceive that it will exalt their moral nature. Their mistake is due to their having run away with such phrases in our preamble as "we aim at the construction of every kind of melody" and with our general statement that "one class of music is hurtful to the moral character, another improves it"; while they have completely missed our qualification of this statement, "in so far as music can improve the moral character."' Yet he too is at heart an ethos-monger; and the great majority of Hellenistic theorists, Peripatetics as well as Academics and Stoics, perhaps out of dislike for the New Music, went back, and upheld absurdly exaggerated forms of the Ethical view.³ It is chiefly against these, though he is not afraid to attack Plato himself as well, that Philodemus' shafts are aimed. His line of attack, in so far as it can be reconstructed, seems to be as follows.

The word *μουσική* in classical times covered what we call music and poetry, and even dancing (Plat., *Alc.* I, 108c). Philodemus thinks that this fact has led to a confusion of thought, what is solely the effect of one element, the words, having been attributed to the others. He is at pains to make clear the distinction in Book IV, col. 29, 12 ff.

'Now therefore I say that not only myself, but also common usage and Aristoxenus who is surnamed "the Musician" call even lyre-players musicians (*μουσικούς*); and that musicians also produce pieces which are devoid of significance (*ἀσήμαντα*), as instrumental music and trilling⁴ are; . . . and that men like Pindar and Simonides were not merely musicians, but both musicians and poets; that *qua* musicians they gave pleasure, and *qua* poets they wrote the words, and perhaps even in this capacity did not improve men, or at all events improved them only to a small extent; and then not only the musical, or even principally, but all educated people alike.'

μουσική, then, has come to mean in common parlance what we now mean by music, that is, sound and rhythm; but Philodemus tells us (IV, col. 26, 27-35) that there were still people who were surprised that he and his like allowed the title of 'musician' to the lyre-player, *κρουματοποιός*; hence the necessity for making the distinction. For what he is going to maintain is, that whereas a musician in the old sense *can* have a moral effect, namely by his words, in the new and

¹ See Rostagni, *loc. cit.*

² Tr. H. S. Macran.

³ Abert, *op. cit.* pp. 19 ff.; 32 ff.

⁴ Cf. Ps.-Arist. *Probl.* XIX, 10.

restricted sense he can have none. He cannot even arouse or allay any particular feeling.

The clearest statement of this view is in IV, col. 3, the passage which attracted Mr Denniston's attention:

'And therefore a musician who seeks for such a science, by which he will be able to distinguish how to dispose the various feelings in various ways, is seeking a knowledge of the non-existent, and idly imparts precepts on the subject, since no melody, *qua* melody, being irrational (*ἄλογον*), either rouses the soul from a state of tranquillity and repose and leads it to the condition which belongs naturally to its character, or soothes and quietens it when it is aroused and moving in any direction; nor can it turn it aside from one impulse to another, or intensify or diminish an existing disposition. For music is not an imitative art (*μιμητικόν*), as some people fondly imagine, nor does it, as this man says, have similarities to moral feelings which, though not imitative, yet express all ethical qualities such as magnificence, humbleness, courage, cowardice, orderliness and violence—any more than cookery.'

Let us examine the reasons for this hardy statement; first of all, for the rejection of the 'imitative' theory. Plato in the *Laws* (668B) assumed that all music was in some sense *μίμησις*, and that on this point no one would disagree.¹ The passage in which Philodemus argues against this view is lost, though its existence is testified to by a fragment from Book III (fr. 55K). Some light is thrown on the subject, however, by two fragments from the Fourth Book of his *περὶ ποιημάτων* (C.A. II, 148-158), which occur among a small number published in a paper by Gomperz in 1865.² In the first (col. 4) an opponent has apparently said that, by contrast with Tragedy and Epic, which are *μιμήσεις* of divine and heroic actions, *ἀνθρωπικωτέρας* 'Ἀρχίλοχόν τε καὶ Ἀριστοφάνην μιμηῖσθαι πράξεις. Philodemus replies with a sentence now fragmentary, in which we can make out the words *ὃν ὁ μὲν Ἀρχίλοχος οὐδ' ἂν μιμηῖσθαι, ὁ δ' Ἀριστοφάνης*. . . . From this it emerges that Philodemus, while he may have allowed drama to be in a sense 'imitative', denied that the word had any meaning as applied to the self-expression of Archilochus' Iambics. He is here making a distinction made by Plato once in the *Republic* (III, 394B ff.), where the word *μίμησις* is used simply to mean impersonation, without the special significance attached to it elsewhere. In the second fragment (col. 8) Philodemus makes a statement about poetry, and adds as his reason 'because it is impossible to imitate things by voice and sounds; it is only possible to imitate their voices and sounds': *διὰ τὸ φωνῇ καὶ ψόφοις ἀδύνατον εἶναι πράγματα μιμῆσθαι, καὶ μὴ μόνον φωνὰς καὶ ψόφους αὐτῶν*.³ It looks as though Philodemus will only allow the term *μίμησις* to mean quite simply what we mean by 'imitation', rejecting those subtler meanings generally attached to the word by Plato and Aristotle. Had it not been that a less critical age had assumed that the function of art was to imitate, Plato and Aristotle would probably have found some different term to express their ideas. As it is, their use of the term was misleading.⁴ In Philodemus' sense the word could only be applied to music which was in the crudest sense imitative, such as Plato himself deprecated (*Laws* 669C). This may account for his statement that music is not *μιμητικόν*.

Another reason for his view may be found in the nature of the New Music of the post-classical period. Early Greek music, even when unaccompanied by song, seems to have been representative. A famous instance is the *νόμος* of Sacadas, which won the prize at Delphi in 586. This was a flute solo representing the

¹ Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, I, 2.

² *Die herculanischen Rollen*. Zeitschrift für d. oesterr. Gymn. 1865, X. Heft. C.A. II, 148-58.

³ Cf. *περὶ ποιημάτων* II, fr. 2 (Hausrath).

⁴ Cf. J. Adam on *Rep.* X, 595C; J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity*, Vol. I, pp. 51-2; S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, ch. II.

victory
tions i
which
More
lem X
quality
of the
include
comple
and tu
ἀξιολό
μουσικ
ceased
tive sic
known

So
followe
ὁμοιότη
is the c
be as f
ethical
people
col. 2 :

'N
receive
there is
and de
Chrom
respect
solemn
vulgar
Chrom
either s
what p
its natu

Th
vary st
gives h
points
the diti
same m
origina
into so
express
ecstatic
informs
was onc
Sir Jam

¹ Paus
² 'Die
den gan
neuen M
ischen P

victory of Apollo over the Python.¹ But with the Sophistic Age, with the complications introduced by Phrynis and Timotheus, a new kind of music arose, the *ποικίλη*, which mixed up the old modes, whose ethos had been distinct and easily perceptible. More than one note might be sounded at once; and in the Pseud-Aristotelian Problem XIX, 27 we are told parenthetically that where this occurs there is no ethical quality—*ἡ γὰρ συμφωνία οὐκ ἔχει ἦθος*.² Much more depended now on the virtuosity of the player. Plato, in the *Laws* (669) attacks such innovations bitterly; and he includes among them the divorce of words and music, though that was no innovation, complaining that 'it is the hardest of tasks to discover what such wordless rhythm and tune signify, or what model worth considering they represent'—*ὅτῳ εἴκει τῶν ἀξιολόγων μιμημάτων*. This very passage is summarized by Philodemus in *περὶ μουσικῆς* I, fr. 1, but his criticism is lost. It is certain, however, that music had long ceased to be the handmaid of poetry, and that both the ethical and the representative sides of it had in practice become less and less important. In the music best known to Philodemus and his sources they may have completely disappeared.

So much for Philodemus' denial of *μίμησις*. But one opponent, probably a follower of Aristotle,³ said that music, while it may not be mimetic, has nevertheless *ὁμοιότητος ἡθῶν*, so that it can express (*ἐπιφαίνεσθαι*) various ethical qualities. This is the crux of the matter. And this too Philodemus denies. His grounds seem to be as follows. First, Diogenes had said that the various kinds of music have their ethical effect intrinsically (*φύσει*, IV, col. 7, 31; 8, 3); but experience shows that people react differently to the same kind of music. This is pointed out in Book IV, col. 2:

'Now with regard to these things it is possible for varying impressions to be received corresponding to predispositions; but with regard to the actual hearing there is no difference whatsoever, all having the same perceptions of the same melody and deriving like pleasure from it; thus both in the case of the Enharmonic and the Chromatic scale people differ, not in respect of the irrational perception, but in respect of their opinions (*δόξας*), some, like Diogenes, saying that the Enharmonic is solemn and noble and straightforward and pure, and the Chromatic unmanly and vulgar and mean, while others call the Enharmonic severe and despotic, and the Chromatic mild and persuasive; both sides importing ideas which do not belong to either scale by nature. Whereas the more scientific thinkers bid us cull from each what pleases the ear, thinking that none of the qualities imputed belongs to either by its nature.'

There is considerable weight in this argument. Opinions on the ethos of music vary startlingly from person to person and age to age. The example Philodemus gives here is not particularly striking, and we may quote some others. He himself points out elsewhere (I, fr. 18) that the difference in the supposed ethical effects of the dithyrambs of Pindar and Philoxenus is very great, although they both use the same mode (the Phrygian). Heraclides Ponticus tells us that the Ionian mode had originally a rough, austere and proud quality, but that it subsequently degenerated into softness and drunkenness.⁴ Plato (*Rep.* 339B) says that the Phrygian Mode expresses sobriety and resignation, whereas Aristotle (*Pol.* 1341A) considers it ecstatic and purgative. And there are modern parallels. A musical colleague informs me that the chord of the diminished seventh, which now seems sentimental, was once a stock device of operatic composers for producing a blood-curdling effect. Sir James Jeans, in his recent work *Science and Music* (p. 183), remarks that 'Plato

¹ Paus. X, 17; Poll. X, 84.

² 'Diese wenigen Worte enthalten im Kern den ganzen Unterschied der alten und der neuen Musik.' C. Stumpf: *Die pseudaristotelischen Probleme über Musik*, p. 63 (Abhand. d.

Berl. Akad. 1896).

³ *Pol.* VIII, 1340A. But cf. Plato, *Laws* 798D.

⁴ Cf. Athen. XIV, p. 625; Th. Reinach, *La Musique Grecque*, p. 45.

associated our modern key of C major with sorrow, weakness and self-indulgence,¹ while Helmholtz associates it with brightness and strength, and Pauer with purity, innocence, manliness and other virtues. And Helmholtz . . . describes D flat major as soft, veiled and harmonious, while Pauer's list tells us that it has fullness of tone, sonority and euphony.'

The second argument of Philodemus against the view that music has *ὁμοίότητες ἡθῶν* is based on his view of the nature of sensation. His opponents' theory rests on the assumption that music has a direct sympathetic connection with the soul. Aristotle speaks of its *ὁμοίωμα τοῖς ἡθεσιν* (*Pol.* 1340a), and Aristides Quintilianus (p. 95M) credits the pupils of Damon with saying, *φθόγγοι εἰσκασι τοῖς τῆς ψυχῆς κινήμασι τε καὶ παθήμασι*. The idea came from the Pythagoreans (*Ptol. Harm.* III, 7). St. Augustine speaks of an '*occulta familiaritas*' between music and the soul (*Conf.* X, 33).²

The Aristotelian view is well described by Butcher,³ in these words: 'Though we may not be able entirely to comprehend the Greek point of view as to the moral import of music, we must bear in mind that the dominant element in Greek music was the rhythm; the spirit and meaning of any given composition was felt to reside especially here; and the doctrine which asserted the unique imitative capacity of music had for Aristotle its basis in this, that the external movements of rhythmical sound bear a close resemblance to the movements of the soul. Each single note is felt as an inward agitation. The regular succession of musical sounds, governed by the laws of melody and rhythm, are allied to those *πράξεις* or outward activities which are the expression of a mental state.' This is the purport of the answer given to the question twice posed in the Pseud-Aristotelian problems: 'Why is it that sounds alone of sense-data possess *ethos*?' Sound, unlike the other sense-data, consists in movements. Philodemus, attacking the theory in a mutilated fragment (III, fr. 52), expresses it in the words *ῥυθμίζεσθαι πως τὰ ἡθῆ διὰ τῶν παθῶν*. It should be noted, however, that Aristotle expressly states that melodies as well as rhythms have in them *μυήματα ἡθῶν* (*Pol.* VIII, 5, 8, 9).

Now the whole idea that music can affect the soul directly, besides savouring of Pythagorean mysticism, conflicts with the Epicurean account of perception.⁴ According to Epicurus all the senses are alike in their method of operation; sound has no peculiar properties. Moreover all sensation is in itself devoid of cognitive significance, irrational, *ἄλογος* (*Diog. L.*, X, 31). Three times in Book IV alone Philodemus uses this word *ἄλογος* of music.⁵ In itself music is purely formal, *ἀκοῆς μόνον* (col. 10, 19). And therefore it has, *φύσει*, no cognitive effect; for it is not until *δόξα* comes into play that sounds acquire meaning; and if no cognitive effect, then no ethical effect; for passions and morals can only be influenced by cognitive means, by *λόγοι* and *διανοήματα*; hence Philodemus ridicules the idea that music can be a cure for love, since it consists of mere sound, while such a cure depends on reason, which explains the waste and harm and insatiability that afflict the lover (IV, col. 13); nor will he allow it to be a consolation for the misfortunes of love; that again is a matter for the reason (col. 15); while as for morals, 'It is unthinkable', he says, 'that sounds which merely move the irrational hearing should contribute anything towards a disposition of soul capable of distinguishing the expedient and the inexpedient in our social relationships' (col. 24): [*οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπισητὸν ἀκοῆς ἀλόγων*

¹ This depends, however, on the identification with the Lydian Mode with our Major, which is a matter for doubt.

² Abert, *op. cit.* p. 48.

³ Aristotle's *Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*, pp. 131-2.

⁴ The dependence of Philodemus' aesthetics on the Epicurean system as a whole may be

illustrated, for instance, by his identification of *ἀλθῆα* and *πάντα*. Compare *περὶ ποιημάτων* V, col. 5, 29-34, and *Sext. Emp. adv. Math.* VIII, 9; U. 244. There is an Oxford Papyrus fragment of a work *περὶ αἰσθήσεως* by ? Philodemus, Vol. I, 19 (Scott).

⁵ Col. 3, 12; col. 19, 15; col. 24, 12.

μόνης κυ
καὶ ἀλν
be sayi
music h

If,
nobody
ψυχαγω
ἀκοῆς μόν
to the t

Suo
theory o
claims t
bad effe
we must
He was
an effect
have; w
and oth
effects d
it should
ἄλογος,
influence
a genera
subjectiv
The Ep
their vie
more in

The
The first
Blass to
also we
modes, a
qualities
Empiric
attack sin

But
668A), an
It is ev
view of
side has
of poetry
and Isoc
pleasure
denounce
(I, 6, 30),
hearted o

¹ καὶ τὰς
ἐπὶ τῶν [ὁ]
νομίζων ὡς
(It will be
which are
restoration

μόνης κινητικὰς φωνὰς συμβάλλεσθαι τι πρὸς διάθεσιν ψυχῆς θεωρητικὴν τ[ὴν] λυσιτελῶν καὶ ἀλυσιτελῶν πρὸς τὰς ἀλλήλους συμπολιτείας. And in Book III, fr. 52 he appears to be saying that to think that music has its effect by ὁμοιώματα is to presume that music has certain intrinsic virtues,¹ and is therefore unacceptable.

If, then, music has no practical value, its function must be to give pleasure, for nobody denies that it does that; it is composed διὰ τὴν τέρψιν ὁμ[οί]ως [καὶ] τὴν ψυχαγωγία[ν, ἀλλ'] οὐ διὰ τὰ πρὸς τοῦτων ληρούμενα (col. II, 18).² The pleasure is ἀκοῆς μόνον, a direct titillation of the ear in which the mind has no share, analogous to the taste of pleasant food and drink.

Such are the grounds of Philodemus' attack on the exponents of the classical theory of music. The greater part of his work is taken up with refuting in detail claims that had been made, in legend and educational theory, about the good and bad effects of music, many of which were certainly absurd. In estimating its value we must remember that he is dealing with a problem which is unsolved to this day. He was not in a position to realize that music, especially by its rhythm, may have an effect on the nervous system almost directly, as the savage's tom-tom seems to have; we may well believe that certain rhythms are exciting or erotic by nature and others hypnotic. And while he contents himself with demonstrating that the effects do not belong to music φύσει, he ignores the fact that there is no reason why it should not attain conventional significances just as words do. Even if ἀκοή is ἄλογος, and therefore divorced from memory, yet memory and association may influence the communal δόξα, and so give opinions about musical ethos at least a general and temporary validity. Jeans concludes that 'the whole matter is one of subjective imagination, possibly based in the first instance on association of ideas.'³ The Epicureans may have reacted too far against the absurdities of theories; but their views do at least represent a step towards a genuine aesthetic which should be more in accordance with the facts of contemporary music.

There are only two other extant works which take the side of this treatise. The first is the papyrus fragment on the art of music (Hib. Pap. I, 13) attributed by Blass to Hippias of Elis, by Croenert to an early follower of Isocrates.⁴ In this also we hear of cases which tell against the doctrine of the moral effects of the modes, and of absurd enthusiasts who profess to recognize in a piece of music the qualities of an ivy-leaf or a laurel. The second is the work of the Sceptic Sextus Empiricus *Adversus Musicos*, written about 200 A.D., where in paragraphs 19-38 an attack similar in many respects to that of Philodemus is made.⁵

But even Plato had to warn his readers against making ἡδονή their criterion (*Laws* 668A), and Aristotle said that most people now use music for pleasure (*Pol.* 1337A). It is evident that from the time of the Sophists onwards the orthodox ethical view of music was subjected to continual criticism; only, as so often happens, one side has almost completely extinguished the other. It has been the same in the case of poetry. Aristotle took a great step towards subordinating the ethical element; and Isocrates divided the poets into those who instructed and those who gave pleasure (*Nic.* 43-9); but were it not for Strabo's having quoted, in order to denounce it, Eratosthenes' statement that all poets aim at ψυχαγωγία, not διδασκαλία (I, 6, 30), Philodemus' work περὶ ποιημάτων would have been our only relic of a whole-hearted opposition which undoubtedly existed.

¹ καὶ τὰς ὁμάς . . . λέγων . . . γίνεσθαι . . . ἐπὶ τῶν [ὁμοιωμάτων], ἀγνοεῖ διὰ [ὁμοιωσ]εώς γε νομίζων ὡς ἔχ[ει] μέλος ἀρετὰς τινὰς ἐγγυ[ο]μένους. (It will be seen that it is just the key syllables which are lost here; but in the context the restoration is probable.) Cf. also Book III, fr. 27.

² Cf. col. 29, 31, κα[θ'] ὃ μὲν μ[ουσικοὶ] ἵλαρ- [ωκέναι].

³ *Op. cit.* p. 184.

⁴ Cf. W. M. Edwards in *New Chapters on Greek Poetry*, Second Series, p. 91 f.

⁵ Cf. H. Abert, *op. cit.* p. 37.

There are several incidental links between Philodemus' two aesthetic treatises: take for instance the words in IV, col. 29, 32-5, [καθ'] ὁ δὲ ποιηταὶ πεποιηκ[έναι] τοὺς λόγους, ὠφελεῖν δ' ἴσως μὴδὲ κατὰ τοῦτ', ἢ παντελῶς ἐπὶ μικρόν, and again in col. 26, 5: 'Nor would they be able to teach virtue *qua* poets, let alone *qua* musicians.' These passages recall the dictum on poetry in *περὶ π.* V, col. 29: *κἂν ὠφελῇ, καθὼ ποιήματ' οὐκ ὠφελεῖ.* The treatise on poetry is more water-tight than that on music, but both are part of a systematic attempt to free Greece from outmoded theories; and they are based on argument; they are not merely flat denials prompted by 'odium philosophicum'.

The *περὶ μουσικῆς* also throws some light incidentally on the obscure question of the attitude of the Epicureans to music as a pleasure. It is commonly said that they disapproved of it; but of the passages quoted in support of this view there is only one which is unequivocal, the statement of Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Mus.* 27) that Epicurus denied that music contributes to happiness.

Against this there is much to set. The most considerable passage on the subject is in Plutarch,¹ who writes as follows of the Epicureans:

'But music, that is so delightful and charming, they shun and avoid; we could not overlook this even if we would, owing to the inconsistency of Epicurus' words; he declares in his book called *Doubts* that the wise man is fond of shows and takes pleasure more than others in the Dionysiac recitals (*ἀκροάματα*) and spectacles; and yet he will not allow musical discussions and the learned inquiries of critics even at parties. And he advises kings who love the Muses to endure at their table stories of war and vulgar buffoons rather than arguments concerned with musical and poetic problems.'

All that emerges from this is, that Epicurus liked listening to music, but disliked musicological discussions. No more than this need be implied by another passage often quoted, Cicero, *De Fin.* I, 71. There the Epicurean Torquatus, perorating against the laborious studies of Plato, says that he wore himself out *in musicis, geometria, numeris, astris.* In this context *musicis* clearly means the study, not the practice, of music, still less the mere listening to music. We know that Epicurus was antagonistic to culture. 'Blest youth', he wrote to Pythocles, 'set sail in your barque and flee from every form of culture' (D.L. X, 6). His reasons are made clear by two passages at the end of Philodemus' treatise. The first is in col. 36:

'It is a sign that men are poor-spirited and have nothing worth while with which to occupy themselves—for why should I say, "make themselves happy"?—if they labour to learn music for the sake of providing pleasure for themselves in the future, and do not realize what a wealth of recitals is provided publicly, and the chance that we have of sharing in them continually in the city, if we wish; and if they fail to consider that when it goes on for long it exhausts our powers and begins to pall, so that often when performances are long drawn out our attention wanders. Not to mention the fact that the pleasure is not necessary, and that the process of learning and practice that our enjoyment involves is laborious, and cuts out the things most important to our well-being; nor the impropriety of singing like any boy or actively playing the lyre.'

These opinions, strange though they may seem to us, were those of Aristotle. The argument that public recitals suffice is to be found in *Politics* 1339A; and the idea that there is something unseemly about a grown man playing music occurs in the next section: the best people don't do it; you never find the poets representing Zeus as singing or playing.² Philodemus remarks elsewhere (col. 16) that it is good to have music at feasts, but not that *ἐλεύθεροι* should themselves perform.

¹ *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*, 13.

² Cf. 1337B.

The second passage is in col. 38:

'To have something to say and start the ball rolling at parties and other gatherings is not a peculiar gift (of musical knowledge), and it is not, as we decided, a thing valued by all; perhaps it might even provoke laughter if a philosopher were to indulge in it; and the theoretical side is not understood by most people, and, if it is to be mastered, demands trouble, which is a departure from the things that make for happiness.'

Here we have the Epicurean, as usual, in the rôle of champion of the plain man. There is no need for anyone to undergo the labour of becoming cultured. 'Don't be afraid,' wrote Metrodorus,² 'to admit that you don't know which side Hector was on, or the first lines of Homer's poem.'

It was, then, only the labour and impropriety of learning to play and to discuss technical points that the Epicureans deprecated. We have already seen that Epicurus' Wise Man took pleasure in recitals. Diogenes Laertius quotes another passage (X, 6) in which he says that he could not live without certain pleasures, including τὰς δι' ἀκροαμάτων. Any pleasure not harmful was to be welcomed. And music, being ἄλογος, can in itself do no harm. Philodemus is at pains to stress this: it was by their words, not their music, that Ibycus and Anacreon corrupted the young, if indeed they did (IV, col. 14, 8-13). He also seems to approve of the φησικώτεροι at the end of col. II, who bid composers take from any kind of scale what the ear desires. Seneca (*Ep.* 88, 5) says that some people claim Homer as an Epicurean, since he praised the condition of a state at peace living a life of feasting and song.

Too much stress has sometimes been laid on the Puritanical strain in Epicureanism.

L. P. WILKINSON.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Plutarch, *ib.* 12.

ARISTOTLE'S HYMN TO VIRTUE.

THE remarkable poem in which Aristotle addresses 'Aperá and honours the memory of his dead friend Hermias¹ is fortunate in being well preserved. The complete text is given by Athenaeus XV 696a and by Diogenes Laertius V 27, and these authorities are now supplemented by the papyrus of Didymus' Commentary on Demosthenes,² which leaves few of the textual problems in need of a solution. But the poem still raises some questions. It is not clear what kind of poem it was; its literary antecedents and affinities have not been fully studied; its contents still call for some remarks. In spite of Wilamowitz's brilliant treatment³ and Jaeger's acute comments⁴ it is puzzling enough to justify a few words of discussion.

In antiquity, as is well known, it was not clear what kind of a poem this was. It was sung, as Athenaeus reports, daily at the common table of Aristotle and his followers, and for this reason it was thought by some to be a sympotic Paean. Such was the opinion of Demophilus, who claimed that it was impious to sing a Paean in honour of a mere mortal and made this the basis of his legal proceedings against Aristotle. On the other hand Athenaeus, or Hermippus whom he follows, says that the poem cannot be a Paean because Aristotle admits that Hermias is dead and there is no refrain such as there ought to be in a Paean. So he suggests that it was a σκόλιον. Finally Diogenes begins by calling the poem a Paean and goes on to call it a Hymn to Hermias. It is clear that the ancients were perplexed and uncertain whether it was a Paean or a σκόλιον or a Hymn. Its language and metre show that it was choral, but that does not help much in deciding its exact character. The important fact is that this disagreement existed, and there must have been reasons for it. In asking what these may have been we shall discuss what sources Aristotle used and what influences affected his manner of writing.

First, we may ask why the poem was thought to be a Paean. Of course the best reason for so thinking was that it was sung ἐν τοῖς σπονσείοις, and resembled those choral songs which were sung in unison after the tables were removed and the libations made and before the drinking of wine really began (Alcman fr. 71, Xenophanes fr. 1, 13-14, Plat. *Symp.* 176a and e, Plut. *Symp. Quaest.* I 615b, Xen. *Symp.* II 1). A famous example of this kind of poem may be seen in Ariphron's Paean to Health.⁵ This was probably written at the end of the fifth or at the beginning of the fourth century, since its writer is almost certainly the same as the Ariphron who is recorded as being successful in a Dithyrambic competition in the first years of the fourth century,—'Αρίφρων ἐδίδασκεν.⁶ The poem was undoubtedly popular; for Lucian (*Pro Lapsu* 6) quotes its opening and calls it τὸ γνωριμώτατον ἐκείνο καὶ πᾶσι διὰ στόματος, and Maximus of Tyre (VII 1) shows that it was still sung in his time. Quotations from it are to be found in Plutarch (*De Virt. Mor.* 10) and Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Eth.* 49); it seems to have influenced an Orphic poem known to Stobaeus (*Ecl.* L 2, 31); it survives in two inscriptions (*I.G.* III 1, 171, IV² I 132). As it is almost the sole surviving example of a sympotic Paean, its history is all the more remarkable and surely indicates that it was the most popular specimen of its

¹ Fr. 4 Diehl.

² *Berliner klassiker Texte* I ed. Diels-Schubart, pp. 25-27.

³ *Aristoteles und Athen*, II, pp. 404-412.

⁴ *Aristotle*, Eng. Trans., pp. 108-109 and 118-

119.

⁵ Diehl II p. 131, P. Maas, *Epidaurische Hymnen*, pp. 148-149.

⁶ *I.G.* II 3, 1280.

kind and
it must
Aristo-
may be
delight

Aristotl
being :

Both po
consider
resembl
means t
parents
γένετα
writing
draw an
Ariphro
Aphrodi
of love i
cerned
shown, t
glow on
from Pe

but the
descripti
Phrynic

and Sop
Antigone

The idea

All these
such an
Sleep, th
of Mimm
marked h
Seco
for the g
in a way

kind and often sung at festal gatherings. It is not therefore surprising to find that it must have been known to Aristotle and have influenced his own poem.

Aristotle's dependence on Ariphron can be seen first and most clearly in what may be called his choice of imagery. Ariphron, 4-7, enumerates four classes of delight which come from Health and expresses them with some skill and eloquence:

εἰ γάρ τις ἢ πλούτου χάρις ἢ τεκέω
ἢ τὰς ἰσοδαίμονος ἀν-
θρώποις βασιλῆϊδος ἀρχᾶς ἢ πόθων
οὖς κρυφίοις Ἀφροδίτας
ἔρκεσιν θηρεύμεν. . . .

Aristotle surely had these lines in his mind when he spoke of the fruit of 'Αρετά as being:

χρυσοῦ τε κρείσσω
καὶ γονέων μαλακανήτοιο θ' Ὑπνου

Both poets give examples to make their meaning clear, and three examples show a considerable similarity between the two poems. Aristotle's mention of gold resembles Ariphron's mention of wealth. His remarkable mention of γονέων surely means that desire for 'Αρετά is a stronger impulse in a man than his love for his parents; he contradicts the Homeric view that ὧς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἢς πατρίδος οὐδὲ τοκῆων γίγνεται (i 34) or Pindar's τί φίλτερον κεδνῶν τοκέων ἀγαθοῖς (*Isthm.* I 5). Ariphron, writing on a different subject, stresses the pleasure brought by children. But both draw an example from the intimate affections of family life. Finally, while Ariphron speaks candidly of the desires 'which we hunt in the secret snares of Aphrodite', Aristotle almost certainly, though more decorously, hints at the pleasures of love in his words μαλακανήτοιο θ' Ὑπνου. The epithet indicates that he is concerned with more than the mere pleasure of being asleep. As Wilamowitz has shown, the adjective probably means 'mit den weichen Wangen' and refers to the glow on the face of the sleeping person. The idea may be seen in a late inscription from Pergamon, which Wilamowitz quotes (Kaibel No. 243, 12):

οἶον δὲ ὑπνώ[οντος] ἐρέυθεται ἄνθεα μῆ[λων]

but the best parallels to it come from the poetry of an earlier time, when such descriptions were undoubtedly amatory. We may well quote the words of Phrynichus which Sophocles admired:

λάμπει δ' ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρήσι φῶς ἔρωτος (fr. 13 Nauck),

and Sophocles' own variation on the theme, when the Chorus addresses "Ερως in *Antigone* 783-4:

ὧς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαῖς
νεανίδος ἐννυχέις.

The idea survived and was taken up by Horace, who said of Cupido:

pulchris excubat in genis (*Carm.* IV 13, 8).

All these are concerned with love, and there can be little doubt that Aristotle had such an idea in his mind rather than anything resembling Shelley's 'Thy sweet child Sleep, the filmy-eyed.' The sleep to which he refers is like the μέλιχα δῶρα καὶ εὐνή of Mimnermus (fr. 1, 3). In this, as in the other two points, he follows on the lines marked by Ariphron.

Secondly, the two poems have certain metrical features in common. Both are for the greater part composed in 'dactylo-epitrites' of a familiar kind, but both begin in a way unusual for this class of metre. Ariphron begins with

Ἵγεία βροτοῖσι πρεσβίστα μακάρων οο-οο-----οο-
μετὰ σοῦ ναίοιμι τὸ λειπόμενον βιοτᾶς οο-----οο-οο-οο-

and Aristotle with

Ἀρετὰ πολύμοχθε γένει βροτέφ οο-οο-οο-οο-οο-.

Both openings may fairly be called Anapaestic. Aristotle opens with a single Anapaestic Dimeter, while Ariphron seems to use two Anapaestic Dimeters followed by an Anapaestic Dipody. The connection of Anapaests with 'Dactylo-epitrites' is not common. Something of the kind may be seen in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* 497-517 and in Aristophanes' *Birds* 451-459 and 539-547,¹ but the mixture in these cases is more complicated than here and the Anapaests are not concentrated at the beginning. It looks as if this combination were unusual, and this indicates that when Aristotle adopted it he was following Ariphron.²

Thirdly, Aristotle's language seems to show some echoes from Ariphron. Echoes of this kind are hard to estimate in the language of Greek poetry which used a common stock of phrases and images. But these seem too remarkable to be fortuitous:

Aristotle.	Ariphron.
1. γένει βροτέφ	1. βροτοῖσι
2. θήραμα	7. θηρέομεν
5. πόνοιν	8. πόνων
7. ἰσαθάνατον	5. ἰσοδαίμονα
12. σοῖς πόθοις	5. πόθων

Some of these are not very impressive if they are taken in isolation, but the cumulative effect is striking, and certainly the echo of *ἰσοδαίμονος* in *ἰσαθάνατον* and the common use of the plural use of *πόθοι* when the singular would be expected leave no room for doubt. *ἰσαθάνατος* is found only here, and even *ἰσοδαίμων*, though found at Aeschylus *Persae* 634,³ is sufficiently unusual to suggest that another word formed like it with a similar sense depends on it. The plural *πόθοι* is used instead of the singular by Sophocles *O.C.* 333, but it is so uncommon that it strengthens the case here for imitation or reminiscence.

Fourthly, Aristotle's poem is constructed in a way similar to Ariphron's. This may be seen in the following respects. In 1-2 an abstract power is addressed and her desirability for all men stressed. In 1-3 Ariphron makes the same points. In 3-11 Aristotle expands on the theme of *Ἀρετὰ*, and especially on her power to make men endure sufferings. Ariphron's Health is naturally not quite comparable because she does not demand but relieve sufferings, but in 4-9 he gives typical examples of her influence and expressly discusses her relation to *πόνοι*, just as Aristotle does with *Ἀρετὰ*. Finally at the end of both poems the abstract powers are connected with other powers of a more traditional and more strictly mythological character, though not with actual gods. While Aristotle introduces the Muses, Ariphron introduces the Graces, who bring a kind of *εὐδαιμονία*, which may be compared with the immortality which Aristotle makes the Muses grant to Hermias.

It seems then that those who believed Aristotle's poem to be a Paean could

¹ Cf. Wilamowitz, *Griechische Verskunst*, pp. 439 and 528.

² A similar combination may be seen in two other poems which look as if they too had come under Ariphron's spell. The Paean of Licymnius and Aristonius' Hymn to Hestia both begin with the metrical form οο-οο-ο-ο-ο-ο-ο-ο- which looks like an Anapaestic Dipody followed by an

Iambic Tripody. Since both continue with 'Dactylo-epitrites', it looks as if they followed the same general principles as Ariphron. Otherwise the combination is rare.

³ Pindar, *Nem.* IV 84 is not relevant since the words *βασιλεῦσιν ἰσοδαίμονα φῶτα* mean 'a man equal in fortune to kings'.

support t
in its co
Hermipp
Paeon, b
reason.
that the
ceremoni
shortened
thought t
the old ty
the new v
have had
Gorg. 45
(ap. Athe
Plutarch
speaking
παιανίζοντ
resemble
We can s
papyrus
metre. C
common
Ariphron
praise to
ciple whe
an elabor
and a cho
to Apollo
song from
was actual
were ofte
understan
this poem
Arist
it was no
fact that
But there
Paeon is
Apollo, th
Paeans to
closely as
after Apo

Licymniu
to have co

¹ Cf. H. E.
der Antike II

support their claim not only by the time at which it was sung but also by elements in its composition which are to be found in the Paean of Ariphron. Of course Hermippus or Athenaeus may have been right in saying that it was not properly a Paean, but it was at least sufficiently like a Paean to be taken for one with good reason. And we may notice that Ariphron's Paean too has no refrain. The fact is that the sympotic Paean of the fourth century was different from the more formal, ceremonial Paean of the fifth as we know it from Pindar. The form had been shortened, simplified and to some extent secularized, and that is why other authorities thought that Aristotle's poem was not a Paean but a σκόλιον, for it is clear that when the old type of Paean gave place to the new, the new had something in common with the new choral σκόλιον. Both were sung in convivial company, and neither seems to have had the old characteristics of the Hymn. So when Dicaearchus (Schol. Plat. *Gorg.* 451e) says of one type of σκόλιον that it was ὑπὸ πάντων ᾄδόμενον, and Artemon (ap. Athen. XV 694a) that it was ὁ δὲ πάντας ᾄδειν νόμος ἦν, we can understand why Plutarch (*Symp. Quaest.* I 1. 5) seems to confuse the Paean and the σκόλιον when, speaking of the latter, he says πρῶτον μὲν ἦδον ὥδην τοῦ θεοῦ κοινῶς ἅπαντες μὲν φωνῇ παιανίζοντες.¹ The later sympotic Paean and the later choral σκόλιον must have resembled each other in style and manner no less than in time and place of singing. We can see this from a comparison of Ariphron's Paean with two choral σκόλια on a papyrus in Berlin.² These pieces are short, and they are elaborate in language and metre. One speaks of the Graces, the other of the Muses, but they have nothing in common with the earlier σκόλια. And what is more important, they differ from Ariphron's Paean in one vital respect. They have in them no element of prayer or praise to the gods; they are hardly concerned with what may be called a general principle whether ethical or religious. The first is almost a riddle in verse; the second is an elaborate description of a song. It looks as if the difference between a choral Paean and a choral σκόλιον lay simply in this. The Paean, being descended from a Hymn to Apollo, still kept some religious or ethical tone; the σκόλιον, being a convivial song from the beginning, was profane and secular. It follows that Aristotle's poem was actually less like to a σκόλιον than it was to a Paean. But since the two types were often confused and may not always have been easy to distinguish, we can understand why Hermippus, anxious to remove any imputation of impiety, said that this poem was a σκόλιον.

Aristotle's poem is too serious to be a σκόλιον. But we have yet to show that it was not a Paean of the same type as Ariphron's. That too has no refrain, and the fact that Aristotle mentions and honours a dead man is surely no fatal argument. But there does seem to be an objection which Hermippus did not make. Ariphron's Paean is addressed to Health, who was associated with Asclepius and so with Apollo, the proper object of Paeans. It was after all only a step from writing Paeans to Asclepius, as Sophocles had done, to writing them to Health, who was closely associated with him, as the Hippocratic Oath shows when it invokes Health after Apollo and Asclepius, or Macedonius, when he says in his Paean 27-28:

Ἀσκληπίε, σὴν δὲ δίδου σοφίαν ὑμνοῦντας ἐς αἰεὶ
θάλλειν ἐν βιοτῇ σὺν τερπνοτάτῃ Ὑγίειᾳ.

Licymnius seems even to have dispensed with the intermediary rôle of Asclepius and to have coupled Health directly with Apollo:

Διπαρόμματα μήτερ ὑψίστων θρόνων
σεμνῶν, Ἀπόλλωνος βασιλεία ποθεινά,
πραῦγελως Ὑγίεια. . . .

¹ Cf. H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* II, pp. 45-49.

² *Berliner klassiker Texte*, V 11, pp. 56-62.

Aristotle's 'Aperá has no such close connection with Apollo, and for this reason his poem cannot be regarded as a Paean in the same sense as Ariphron's. Moreover, Health differed from 'Aperá as the subject of a poem in one important respect. She does not seem to have been always and everywhere an abstraction. At least in Ariphron's own town of Sicyon she was certainly the recipient of divine honours. Pausanias (II 11, 6) records the cult of her in the shrine of Asclepius and says that women cut off their hair and offered girdles to her. She was much nearer to being a real divinity than the abstractions whom Pindar sometimes invoked, and no doubt this was why Ariphron wrote a Paean to her. But Aristotle's 'Aperá was in a different position. She had no cult and received no prayers or offerings. A poem to her would hardly be of the same kind as a Paean to Health.

These points show that Aristotle's poem was not a Paean in the strict sense, but they do not show what kind of a poem it was. It might be argued that it was equally not a Hymn, because the Greek definition of a Hymn was a song addressed to a god or goddess. Menander (Περὶ ἐπιδ. p. 331, 17 Spengel) makes the point clear when he defines a Hymn as praise addressed to the gods, and his definition agrees with those of other authorities, such as Ammonius (*De diff. Verb.* p. 52 Valcknaer), who distinguishes Hymns from ἐγκώμια which are addressed to men, Pollux (I 38), who speaks of Hymns as αἱ εἰς θεοὺς ψαλαί, and Isidorus (*Etym.* VI 19, 17), who says firmly *proprie hymni sunt continentes laudem dei*. Until she was identified with the Roman Virtus, 'Aperá was never a goddess in the proper sense. She seems to have been an abstraction in the same sense as some powers whom Pindar invokes such as Ἥρουχία (*Pyth.* VIII 1), Ἑλείθνια (*Nem.* VII 1) and Θεία (*Isthm.* V 1). These were real powers but they were not divine beings. But Aristotle differs from Pindar in that, after the first invocation of an abstraction, he introduces no real god or goddess. He deals with 'Aperá and with her alone. This shows that his poem was not in the proper sense a Hymn. Nor was it an ἐπικήδειον or a θρήνος. The distinction between these two forms was probably not absolute, but it seems that normally the ἐπικήδειον was sung over the body before burial (Ammonius, *De diff. Verb.* p. 54 Valcknaer), while the θρήνος was sung after burial over the tomb and at the yearly festival of remembrance (*Et. Gud.* 200, 3 Sturz, Schol. A. E. Dion. Thrac. 451, 24 Hilgard). Aristotle's poem, which was sung daily over the tables, cannot have been an ἐπικήδειον, but it has something in common with the θρήνος in so far as it was sung in memory of a dead man. But it differed in being sung not yearly but daily.

The solution must be that Aristotle modelled his poem on the Paean but added to it some characteristics of the θρήνος, and addressed in it a power which meant a great deal to him but was not officially in the Greek pantheon. From the θρήνος he took the lamentation for the dead man, and his poem qualifies for Ammonius' description of a θρήνος in that it ὁδυρμὸν ἔχει σὺν ἐγκωμίῳ τοῦ τελευτήσαντος. But from the Paean he took his structure and his place of singing. In so combining, or confusing, two types of poem Aristotle followed the tendencies of the fourth century. A similar confusion may be seen in Philodamus' Paean to Dionysus, in which Dionysus, for whom the right kind of Hymn was the Dithyramb, is addressed in the form proper to Apollo with Apollo's own refrain of Ἦ Παιάν. So too in addressing not an authentic goddess but an abstract power Aristotle also showed contemporary influences. A similar development may perhaps be seen in the case of Ἀλήθεια. For Pindar she was an important power but not divine (*Ol.* X 4, fr. 194), and though Parmenides may have called her a goddess, it is very doubtful if she was really one in his time. But for the philosophers she was so important as to be considered divine, so that Anaxagoras is said to have erected an altar to her (*Ael. V. H.* VIII 19), while at a later date Plutarch (*Qu. Rom.* 11) makes her a daughter of Cronus. Such powers might have more meaning and make more appeal to philo-

sophers
Aristotl
Aristotl
to Apoll
praise to
Aris
'Aperá.
293), wh
Simonid
Bacchyl
undying

With su
woman,
XXXV 7
137). An
another a
Athene a
μένην (fr
Prodicus,
while givi
words (*M*
choice of
his origin
Aristotle
details.

Aristo
to her μορ
a person l
story whic
trasts 'Ar
καθαρότη
same sort
the traits
ζαλωτὸς ἐν
actions an
θανμάζεσθ
the import
can only b
ἐπιμελείας
weary him
saying tha
Xenophon'
δ' ἔλθῃ τὸ π
ἡμνοῦμενοι
sufficiently

sophers than more established and certified deities, and we can understand why Aristotle addressed 'Αρετή in a literary form that had been proper to Apollo. So Aristotle played his part in the process by which the old Paeon, which was the Hymn to Apollo, was gradually adapted to new uses until eventually it became a hymn of praise to such men as Seleucus and Titus Flamininus.

Aristotle was no doubt helped by what previous poets and painters had done for 'Αρετή. She was early personified. The process begins for us with Hesiod (*Op.* 289-293), who said that the way to her was hard and steep, and was advanced when Simonides (fr. 37) made a company of Nymphs her attendants. His nephew, Bacchylides, went considerably further and produced a conception of her as an undying power moving about the earth:

οὐ γὰρ ἀλα[μυ]εῖ νυκ[τὸς]
 πασιφανὴς 'Αρετ[ῆ]
 κρυφθεῖσ' ἀμανοῦν[ται] καλύπτρα,
 ἀλλ' ἔμπεδον ἀκ[αμάτα]
 βρύνουσα δόξα
 στρωφᾶται κατὰ γᾶν[τε]
 καὶ πολὺπλαγκτον θ[άλασσαν].

(XIII 175-181.)

With such antecedents 'Αρετή was naturally portrayed in painting as a woman, and Parrhasius depicted her in the company of Dionysus (Plin. *N.H.* XXXV 70), while she was one of the 'severe' subjects favoured by Aristolaus (*ibid.* 137). Aristotle may have owed something to this tradition, which appeared in another and more popular kind of poetry when Sophocles in his *Κρίσις* presented Athene as *Φρόνησις*, *Νοῦς*, and 'Αρετή, saying that she was *ἐλαίῳ χρομένην καὶ γυμναζομένην* (fr. 361 Pearson). But a more direct source was probably a prose-work of Prodicus, whose writings were known to Aristotle (*Top.* B 611b 22). For Xenophon, while giving credit to Prodicus for using *ἐντι μεγαλειότητος ῥήμασιν*, tells in his own words (*Mem.* II 1, 22-34) a parable which Prodicus had told in his *Ῥωραι*, the famous choice of Heracles between Virtue and Vice. No doubt Xenophon made changes in his original, but the essential elements must go back to Prodicus, and it looks as if Aristotle used the story for his main conception of 'Αρετή and for some of the details.

Aristotle makes 'Αρετή a beautiful maiden. She is *παρθένος* and he twice refers to her *μορφά*. Of this Hesiod and Simonides say nothing; for them 'Αρετή may be a person but she has hardly got a face. But the beauty of 'Αρετή is vital to the story which Xenophon tells. For with the highly coloured and fleshly Vice he contrasts 'Αρετή as *εὐπρεπὴ τε ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐλευθέριον φύσει, κεκοσμημένην τὸ μὲν σῶμα καθαρότητι, τὰ δὲ ὄμματα αἰδοί, τὸ δὲ σχῆμα εὐφροσύνῃ, ἐσθῆτι δὲ λευκῇ* (22). She is the same sort of Maiden as Aristotle's. Moreover, her words to Heracles recall some of the traits which Aristotle gives to his 'Αρετή. First, just as he speaks of *θανεῖν ἁλωτὸς ἐν Ἑλλάδι πότμος* at 4, so she regards Hellas as the proper sphere for noble actions and glory, when she tells Heracles *εἴτε ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πάσης ἀξιοῖς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ θανμάζεσθαι, τὴν Ἑλλάδα πειρατέον εὖ ποιεῖν* (28). Secondly, she supports Aristotle in the importance which he attaches to *πόνος*, when she says that what is worth having can only be got through labour, *τῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας θεοὶ διδάσιν ἀνθρώποις* (28), while Vice promises Heracles that she will not weary him in body and soul (25). Thirdly, just as Aristotle closes his poem by saying that Hermias' memory will be immortal because of his noble actions, so Xenophon's 'Αρετή promises an immortal memory to all who follow her,—*ὅταν δ' ἔλθῃ τὸ πεπρωμένον τέλος, οὐ μετὰ λήθης ἄτιμοι κείνται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ μνήμης τὸν αἰεὶ χρόνον ὑμνούμενοι θάλλουσι* (38). The parallels between the parable and the poem are sufficiently close to permit us to say that for his fundamental idea Aristotle was

probably indebted to Prodicus. From him he took the notion that 'Aperá was some superior and virginal power, worthy of hard service and promising immortal fame.

It is only natural that when a philosopher of Aristotle's stature writes a poem, critics should try to find in it traces of his own special opinions. So it is not surprising that Jaeger develops a suggestion of Wilamowitz and connects the 'Aperá of the poem with Aristotle's Platonic period, saying that 'Virtue here means the divine form of human virtue' and giving as an argument for his view the fact that Aristotle twice refers to the μορφή of 'Aperá. Both the argument and the conclusion may be disputed. The double reference to the beauty of 'Aperá is probably due in the first place to Prodicus, and in the second place to the natural poetical habit of ascribing beauty to supernatural powers however abstract. Pindar uses μορφή of bodily beauty (*Ol.* IX 65, *Nem.* III 19, *Isthm.* VII 22), and the word is quite applicable to a power like 'Aperá who had long been personified and had been presented by Prodicus as a beautiful maiden. It is the same spirit which made Pindar call Justice and Peace χρύσειαι (*Ol.* XIII 8), or Sophocles call Hope 'golden' (*O.T.* 157), or Licymnius address Health as λιπαρόμματα, or an anonymous poet Fortune as ποικιλόμορφε (Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 196, No. 34). Aristotle's invocation of 'Aperá is clear and satisfactory if we assume that he follows earlier writers in making her a beautiful maiden. Moreover, if he were really treating her as the Platonic Form or Idea, his language would surely be different from this. For the word μορφή is used in Platonic and other philosophical literature not for the Form but for manifold appearance. It is not the same as εἶδος but contrasted with it. This distinction may be seen in Philolaus (fr. 5 Diels), who contrasts the two εἶδη into which numbers may be divided, and the πολλαὶ μορφαί of each. So too Plato himself in discussing wrong views of God says that He should not be spoken of as ἀλλάττοντα τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος εἰς πολλὰς μορφάς (*Rep.* II 380d). If μορφή was contrasted with εἶδος in this way, it seems unlikely that it would be used instead of εἶδος to describe the Form of Virtue. In fact it seems highly improbable that any follower of Plato or Aristotle would recognize a hint of Platonic doctrine in these words.

Wilamowitz finds another philosophical reference in 9-11, though he freely admits that it involves a contradiction in the sense. There Diehl prints:

σεῦ δ' ἔνεχ' οὐκ Διὸς Ἡρακλῆος Διὸς τε κόροι
 πόλλ' ἀνέτλασαν ἔργοις
 σὺν ἀγρεύοντες δύναμιν

and it is only natural to connect the δύναμις here mentioned with the δύναμις of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The most obvious parallel, which Wilamowitz does not actually cite, is Aristotle's statement that of the things which come to us by nature we first acquire the potentiality and later exhibit the activity,—ὅσα μὲν φύσει ἡμῖν παραγίνεται, τὰς δυνάμεις τούτων πρότερον κομιζόμεθα, ὕστερον δὲ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἀποδίδομεν (II 1, 1103a 26-27). If the poem uses δύναμις in this special sense, it means that in noble actions men pursue the potentiality of acting even more nobly, or as Wilamowitz says 'die Tugend ist in der Energie eher vorhanden als in der Dynamis'. This view is based on Athenaeus's reading of σὺν ἀγρεύοντες, but it is not certain that this is what Aristotle wrote. The MSS of Diogenes gave ἀναγορεύοντες, which is impeccable so far as sense is concerned, while the papyrus of Didymus gives [ε]ποντε[, from which Diels and Schubart have restored [σὺν δι]έποντες. The text of Didymus raises a problem, since it is hard to see how σὺν διέποντες can have arisen out of either σὺν ἀγρεύοντες or ἀναγορεύοντες. But σὺν διέποντες is itself open to question. διέπειν, which means 'to manage', does not seem very suitable for an abstract word like δύναμις. Yet the papyrus may still give the clue to the right reading. It is possible that the scribe meant to write [σὺν ἀν]ε< >πόντες. If this is right, the different readings fall into place. For then ἀναγορεύοντες of Diogenes is simply another word of the same

meaning which has displaced the original ἀναιπόντες, as often happens in the texts of the lyric poets, while σὺν has dropped out because of ἀν- at the beginning of ἀναγορεύοντες. σὺν ἀγρεύοντες of Athenaeus is then a simple corruption of σὺν ἀναγορεύοντες. There is something to be said for σὺν ἀναιπόντες. It gives excellent sense, for the word is used by Pindar (*Pyth.* I 32, X 8) for proclaiming a victory, and it is commonly used for any kind of proclamation. If it is right, all that Aristotle says is that these heroes proclaim by their deeds the power of Ἀπερά, who incites them. Nothing could be simpler, but this text has little to do with the passage quoted from the *Ethics* or with the philosophical conception of δύναμις. So it is dangerous to detect any philosophical echo in these words.

In conclusion we may perhaps add that it is unwise to look for philosophical ideas in this poem. Such ideas as it does display are largely traditional. What matters is the admiration which Aristotle felt for the kind of ἀρετή which he saw in Hermias. In his poem he was able to express himself more personally and more particularly than he could in a treatise. He was writing in honour of a dead friend; he was concerned with an individual. Naturally his presentation of what he felt had a special, perhaps even an unphilosophical, character. To convey the fullness of his feelings he took the old form of the hymn to Apollo, but he was too deeply moved to address Apollo by name. So instead he addressed the abstract power, which had moved Hermias to die as he did and which seemed to Aristotle nobly superhuman in the calls which it made on men and in the glory which it brought to them.

C. M. BOWRA.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD.

THE GODS IN PLATO, PLOTINUS, EPICURUS.

THE two tractates forming the treatise of Plotinus, called rather misleadingly, to the modern mind, 'On Providence',¹ have attracted attention mainly because of the remarkable stress laid in them on the doctrine of the Logos, which marks an interesting development of Plotinus' latest thought and brings the treatise into an apparently close relation to other systems with which the philosophy of Plotinus has little in common. I do not, however, in this article wish to discuss the Logos doctrine of these tractates, but rather to compare certain other aspects of the thought of the treatise with their probable sources in the work of earlier thinkers, and in particular to draw attention to a curious and unexpected parallelism of thought in one passage. I think that conclusions of some interest for the history of Greek thought in general can be drawn from such a comparison.

The points in the treatise to which I wish to draw special attention are the discussion of free will and the conceptions about the world-order which it involves, and the attitude to the gods and prayer. On these points the thought of the *Περὶ Προνοίας* is stated by M. E. Bréhier in his introduction to the treatise to be closely related to the teaching of the Stoics, and to the *Laws* of Plato; and it is these connections which I wish to consider.

The connection of the ethical thought of the treatise with that of the Stoics is evident enough, and many close parallels can be drawn.² It is, however, worth stressing, in view of what I shall have to say later, that the framework of ethical thinking common to both Plotinus and the Stoics is by no means exclusively confined, in the period immediately preceding the Neo-Platonists, to the latter. This framework of thought may be defined as the belief in an all-embracing eternal cosmic order within which a certain amount of freedom is possible for the individual will, but to which it is the business of the individual will to conform itself. The all-embracingness and the necessary, it may almost be said the automatic, character of the cosmic order are particularly to be noted. It is within this framework that the problem of free will, which plays so large a part in the *Περὶ Προνοίας*, becomes acute. The beginnings of this way of thinking can be found in Aristotle; it is already fairly fully developed in the *Epinomis*;³ and in the post-Aristotelian period it is as characteristic of Epicureans as of Stoics.⁴ It is true that important reservations

¹ *Enn.* III. 2-3; *Περὶ Προνοίας*.

² E.g. 2 ch. 15e: 40-5, with Epictetus, *Encheiridion* 17. The whole of this chapter is strongly Stoic. Cp. also Epictet. *Diss.* I. 25. 29. 2. 2. 4 with Sen. *Epist.* 116, 21. 3. 2. 7-12 with Sen. *De Provid.* 2. 9. 34 with *Stoicorum vet. Fragm.* III. 334. 25 Chrysippus.

³ 982-985B, 986C, 991E. Though the emphasis on mathematics in this dialogue is characteristically Platonic-Pythagorean, the insistence on the order of the heavens is thoroughly in accord with later thought.

⁴ For the world-order in the Stoics cp. Diog. Laert. VII. 87-89. For its close connection with the exaltation of the star-divinities, which brings it into relation with the conception of the world-order in the *Epinomis* and *Laws* XII. 966B ff., see *St. vet. Fragm.* II. 645. 528, Manilius V. 723 ff., etc. It must be noted, however, that there is an important difference between the attitude of the Stoics to the cosmos, and especially to the divine

element in it, and that of their contemporaries. As I hope to show later, the Epicureans (and to some extent Plotinus) follow as regards τὸ θεῖον what may be called the most distinctively Hellenic tradition, that which reaches its highest development in Book Λ of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*; that is, they stress the utter detachment of the divinity from human life, its indifference to our affairs, its self-absorption. In the Stoics, on the contrary, we meet both a passionate belief in the regulation of human affairs in detail by the divine providence and a passionate devotion to the divine cosmos. In both, to some extent, they follow the Plato of the *Timaeus* and the *Laws*, and the teachings of the *Epinomis*, but there seems to be a genuinely new spirit and emphasis, probably of Oriental origin (cp. Bréhier, *Hist. de la Philosophie* I, p. 297; Bidez, *Cité du Monde et cité du Soleil chez les Stoiciens*, especially pp. 254-257).

must be
important
individual
the atom
Plotinus,
the Stars
by the &
or backg
can nor s
There is
far remo
exaggera
the cosm
physical
spiritual
are close
to which

Then
more clo
world-ord
necessity,
of chance
of the irr
in both t
and Epicu
unknowab
tion of Ne

For F
were both
is opposed
the physic
Plato and
among the
Cornford d
the blind,
in Thucydi
been origin
that, while
principle o
himself wit
for an erra
conception

¹ Letter to
² II. 3.

³ To Herod
⁴ To Meno

mentary, *Epi*
⁵ 47B-48A.

⁶ *Agarav*, w
Menoec. 133.

⁷ Cp. Plato,
⁸ See the v

Plato's *Cosmolo*
⁹ Ar. *Phys.* I

¹⁰ Cornford,

must be made to this statement in the case of Epicurus. Free will is of far more importance to him, because his attention is concentrated on the well-being of the individual; hence the device of the *παρέγκλισις*, the *clinamen* or arbitrary swerve of the atoms. He rejects, too, physical determinism with the utmost emphasis.¹ Plotinus, however, rejects the astrological determinism of his day in the treatise 'Are the Stars Causes?'² as emphatically as Epicurus does the total mastery of man's life by the *δεσπότης ἀνάγκη*; and Epicurus admits the existence of an eternal³ framework or background of necessity, the interplay of atoms in the void, from which we neither can nor should wish to escape; and from knowledge of which comes true freedom. There is a difference of emphasis, and of course Epicurus' atoms and void are very far removed from Plotinus' hierarchy of emanation. It is, however, possible to exaggerate the difference—especially from the point of view of the relation between the cosmos and the individual—between the Epicurean background of unchanging physical and material necessity and the necessary, eternal, unfolding of the great spiritual principles which forms the setting of human life in Plotinus. At least, they are close enough to account for a curious resemblance in one aspect of their theology, to which it is my purpose to call attention.

There is, however, one aspect of the thought of Epicurus in which he appears more closely related to Plato than to the later thinkers who stressed the eternal world-order. This is his tripartite division of happenings into those caused by necessity, those caused by chance, and those within our control.⁴ This appearance of chance as a separate force, 'co-ordinate with necessity' (Bailey), is reminiscent of the irrational element in nature, the 'errant cause' in the *Timaeus*.⁵ We have in both two forces in the world besides the human will, one regular, to both Plato and Epicurus knowable, to Plato also rational, and the other erratic, unpredictable,⁶ unknowable, irrational. The interesting thing to notice is the change in the conception of Necessity, 'Ἀνάγκη', which is implied in the setting beside it of *τύχη*.

For Plato and Aristotle Necessity and Chance were almost synonymous.⁷ They were both names for the blind, irrational, spontaneous element in nature.⁸ Necessity is opposed to purpose.⁹ Further, in attacking the attribution of all happenings in the physical world to Chance or Necessity, which may also be identified with Nature, Plato and Aristotle regard themselves as attacking a view widely current not only among their predecessors the Pre-Socratics but also among their contemporaries.¹⁰ Cornford detects this division of the happenings of this world into those caused by the blind, irrational element *τύχη* and those caused by human purpose, *γνώμη*, even in Thucydides.¹¹ Thus we see that what Epicurus has done, and he seems to have been original in doing it,¹² is to split the traditional conception of Chance-Necessity so that, while remaining strictly within the bounds of his system and involving no principle of explanation which is immaterial or possessed of reason, he provides himself with a framework or background of regularity and order while leaving room for an erratic, capricious principle in the world. The most probable source for this conception is, I suppose, to be found in a combination of the popular idea of *τύχη*

¹ Letter to Menoeceus, 134.

² II, 3.

³ To Herodotus, 39.

⁴ To Menoeceus, 133-4. See Bailey's commentary, *Epicurus*, p. 341.

⁵ 47E-48A.

⁶ *δοτατον*, whereas Necessity is only *ἀνυπεύθυνον*, Menoec. 133.

⁷ Cp. Plato, *Laws* 889c.

⁸ See the valuable discussion by Cornford in *Plato's Cosmology*, pp. 165-177.

⁹ Ar. *Phys.* B 8, 198b.

¹⁰ Cornford, l.c.

¹¹ Cornford, p. 171.

¹² In Plato, *Laws* X 888E a popular and fashionable doctrine is mentioned according to which all things come about *τὰ μὲν φύσει, τὰ δὲ τέχνῃ, τὰ δὲ διὰ τύχην*, which certainly looks like a distinction between *φύσις* and *τύχη*. On the other hand, in Plato's more detailed description of the doctrine, 889A ff., the two seem to be regarded again as practically synonymous. On chance and necessity in the Atomists see Cornford, pp. 169-170; Bailey, *Greek Atomists and Epicurus*, p. 122.

'the element of feminine caprice in the world', with the Fate, the fixed eternal world-order, of the astrological determinists.¹ Epicurus resents the attempt of the φυσικοί to make this latter supreme over human life, but does not altogether deny its existence.² It is, however, tempting to recognize in this distinction a conscious attempt to provide an adequate substitute for the Platonic cosmology, on a materialistic basis. This could not be so adequately done as long as there was no principle of regularity in the world to work beside the 'errant cause'. If this is really so, if Epicurus' ἀνάγκη is a substitute for the rational, purposive element in the world of Plato and Aristotle, there would be a touch of mockery in the use of the word κόσμοι, which stood for everything that his predecessors valued and held to be good and rational in the world, for the infinite number of worlds which come rather casually into being within the eternal whole of atoms and void.³ There is, however, an important point, besides his materialism, in which Epicurus differs from Plato in his distribution of functions between the regular and the irregular cause. This is, that in Epicurus' system there is no 'dualism', no conflict of principles; there is no question of Necessity's imposing itself, by force or by persuasion, on Chance. The two work side by side. Thus Epicurus' world is unified in a way in which Plato's is not, and is closer to the world of Plotinus and the Stoics; though his world remains, if we must not say mechanical, at least material-inorganic, and theirs is organic.

I have said that the world of Plotinus is unified, that there is not in it any dualism, any struggle with an irrational principle, and this, I think, is true of his normal thought. There are, of course, exceptions.⁴ Whenever Plotinus turns to consider the nature of ἔλγῃ as it is in itself, as he does in I. 8 and II. 4, he seems irresistibly drawn to the conclusion that it is the principle of evil. His general view, however, of the world as an organic whole⁵ is not compatible with this belief, and it does not seem to occur in the particular treatise 'On Providence' under discussion.⁶ It is replaced by the more characteristic conception that all things, down to the lowest degree of imperfection, the greatest falling short in being compatible with any sort of existence, are necessary to the completeness of the All.⁷ This refusal to accept the easy solution of making matter the principle of evil makes the problem of the origin of evil, and in particular of sin, of human free will and its misuse, peculiarly acute for Plotinus in this treatise. He solves it, to his own satisfaction at least, by the genuinely Platonic conception of eternally pre-existing souls coming into this world from a higher realm, and acting and suffering according to the law of their being.⁸

The absence of the notion of a 'disorderly' element in the world from the Περὶ Προνοίας results in a very important difference between Plotinus' attitude as expressed here to the gods and prayer and that of Plato in the *Laws* from which Bréhier supposes Plotinus to have derived his doctrine.⁹ In the tenth book of the *Laws*¹⁰ there is a refutation of the opinion that the gods are παραιτητοὶ τοῖσιν ἀδικοῦσι, δεχόμενοι δῶρα. In this the gods are represented as sternly just rulers of the cosmos,

¹ Cp. Bidez, *Écoles Chaldéennes*, vol. offert à J. Capart, pp. 65-68. *Cité du Soleil*, pp. 262-267 (*Ann. de l'Inst. de Philologie et d'Hist. Orientales*, T. III, 1935.)

² I should prefer to read ἐγγελώντος (Bailey) or διαγγελώντος (Usener) rather than Kühn's ἀνελόντος (which does not fit the context) in Menoec. 133. 7.

³ To Herodotus, 45; To Pythocles, 88. The distinction between τὸ πᾶν (including the void) and τὸ ὄλον, which is equivalent to ὁ κόσμος, is Stoic. *St. vel. Fragm.* II. 522-525. But for Epicurus τὸ πᾶν discharges the function of

'background of regularity' performed by κόσμος in the Stoics.

⁴ Notably I. 8; II. 4, 16.

⁵ Cp. II. 9; VI. 4-5; VI. 7, etc.

⁶ It seems to be explicitly denied in III. 3, 4; note especially the words ὁ λόγος δὲ λεγέσθω ἔχειν καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ τῆς ὕλης, etc.; but cp. ch. 5, line 21 ff.

⁷ E.g. III. 2, 14; cp. II. 9, 13.

⁸ III. 2, 17, 18.

⁹ Introduction to the treatise, Budé Plotinus, vol. III, pp. 22-23.

¹⁰ 905D-907B.

active, we may assume from the suggestion earlier,¹ like the Demiourgos of the *Timaeus*, in the eternal struggle to make order prevail over disorder in the world.² Plato's comparison of the gods of the *Laws* to earthly rulers, shepherds, steersmen, generals, guards, etc., would lose a great deal of meaning if we assume (contrary to the earlier passage 896e and the teaching of the *Timaeus*) that the world-order is complete and completely good. These active souls—gods, leaders and rulers of the cosmos—will no more take bribes than a good earthly ruler would. The prayers and sacrifices of the wicked are useless because the gods are not immoral.

When we turn to the Plotinus passage³ we find ourselves in an entirely different world of thought. The uselessness of prayer, not only in the case of the wicked but also in that of the weak and inefficient,⁴ is due to the inexorability of the natural law, *οἱ ἐν τῷ παντὶ νόμοι*. Those who go contrary to nature, to the unified rhythm and ordered arrangement of the cosmos as a whole, even if it is not through their own fault, will suffer for it.⁵ The stress is no longer on the moral questions of the justice of the gods and the punishment of the wicked; though there is room within Plotinus' conception for Plato's answers to them, and the doctrines that it is a punishment to the wicked to be wicked and that there is retribution after death duly appear in the chapter under discussion.⁶

The most striking difference, however, between the world view of the *Περὶ Πρωτοίας* and that of Plato is to be found in their respective descriptions of 'the gods'. We have already examined the gods of the *Laws*. In Plotinus' treatise the gods and daemons occur simply as organic parts of the universal order,⁷ the largest and most important parts, it is true,⁸ but still parts, and subject to the universal law. The star-gods, of whom Plotinus normally seems to be thinking when he speaks of 'the gods', certainly have cosmic functions to perform, unlike the gods of Epicurus, but they are thought of as performing them in an automatic, almost mechanical way, without trouble or conscious thought or disturbance of their life, like the organs of a plant or animal.⁹ This universal order, too, is hardly to be compared with that of the Platonic cosmos, the work of a soul or souls standing in some undefined and independent relation to the Ideas. Again, it does not necessarily conflict with Plato's conception, but it goes beyond it and is far more definite.¹⁰ For Plotinus the visible cosmos is the lowest stage in the development or unfolding of reality, produced by a process of 'necessary emanation' without reasoning or forethought,¹¹ the result of an unconscious reflex of the strange, dream-like contemplation which is the activity of Nature.¹² Its necessary character, the all-embracingness of the universal law and order, derives from the eternal presence of all things in the lower spheres organically united in the higher realm of *Noûs*.¹³ One of the most important functions which *Noûs* performs in the philosophy of Plotinus is that of a hypostatization of the concept of the eternal world-order. Perhaps the most striking expression of the position of the gods in the unified cosmos of Plotinus is to be found in a passage in the first of the two tractates, *Περὶ Πρωτοίας*,¹⁴ which is worth quoting at length: *κακοὺς δὲ*

¹ 896e: 'At least two souls . . .'

² I do not wish to suggest that Plato ever thought for a moment that the 'orderly' and 'disorderly' elements were on anything like equal terms (this would be contrary to all the evidence), but only that the universal order is not something necessary and automatic. The forces of good do not have it all their own way. Cp. Cornford, op. cit. p. 209.

³ III. 2. 8-9.

⁴ III. 2. 8.

⁵ Cp. II. 9. 7 (simile of the tortoise and the dance).

⁶ Cp. also ch. 13.

⁷ 2. 3.

⁸ 2. 8.

⁹ II. 3. 5, 7; IV. 26, 42.

¹⁰ Cp. Cornford on the Demiurge of the *Timaeus*, op. cit. pp. 34-39. The suggestion on p. 39 of a close relation between the Aristotelian conception of *φύσις* and the Demiurge would bring Plato closer to Plotinus; but, as Cornford says, it must remain only a suggestion.

¹¹ III. 2. 1.

¹² III. 8. 3-4.

¹³ III. 3. 3; VI. 7. 12, etc.

¹⁴ III. 2. 9.

γενομένους ἀξιοῦν ἄλλους αὐτῶν σωτήρας εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς προεμένους οὐ θεμιτὸν εὐχὴν ποιουμένων· οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ θεοὺς αὐτῶν ἄρχειν τὰ καθέκαστα ἀφέντας τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον οὐδέ γε τοὺς ἀνδρας τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς, ἄλλον βίον ζῶντας τὸν ἀρχῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἀμείνω, τοὺτους αὐτῶν ἄρχοντας εἶναι. The situation could not be more clearly summed up. The wicked (or, as we learn from the previous chapter, the weak, and those who have failed to understand and act according to the laws of nature) endure the consequences of being what they are through the automatic, inevitable working out of the ordered cosmic processes. Their fate is no concern of the gods, or of good men (i.e. philosophers). Gods and philosophers form what might be called the privileged or aristocratic orders of cosmic society.¹ They live their own exalted lives, abiding in them by virtue of their own merits, and it would be absurd and contrary to the order of things to expect them to disturb themselves to look after their inferiors. They have neither the will nor the power to come to the help of their fellow-men who are sinning, or even of those who are suffering. Plotinus, of course, at least in some moods, states that human suffering is merited by sin in a former life.² The contrast between this conception of gods and good men and the gods of the *Laws*, or the philosophers of the *Republic*, is too clear to need stressing. It is of a piece with the magical theory of prayer, as depending for its efficacy not on the will of any divine being but on the setting in motion of cosmic forces through the universal sympathy which is expounded in the *Fourth Ennead*.³

For a most striking parallel to the passage above quoted we must turn again to Epicurus. Jensen, by his brilliant discovery and reconstruction of considerable remains of a letter of Epicurus in the tenth book of Philodemus *Περὶ Κακιῶν*,⁴ has shown that to Epicurus communion with the gods was a very real possibility; he represents himself in the letter as in close and friendly converse with Asclepius, who speaks of Epicurus as 'sharing in the goodwill of certain gods, and promises him his protection'.⁵ One of the most interesting consequences that springs from this discovery is a possibility of a new interpretation of a difficult passage in the Letter to Menoeceus.⁶ The relevant words, in Jensen's text, are: οὐ γὰρ πολὺήψεις εἰσὶν ἀλλ' ὑπολήψεις ψευδεῖς αἱ τῶν πολλῶν ὑπὲρ θεῶν ἀποφάσεις, ἐνθεν αἱ μέγισται βλάβαι καὶ αἰκίαι τοῖς κακοῖς ἐκ θεῶν ἐπάγονται καὶ ὠφέλειαι· ταῖς γὰρ ἰδίαις οἰκειούμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἀρεταῖς τοῖς ὁμοίοις ἀποδέχονται πᾶν τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον ὡς ἀλλότριον νομίζοντες. The situation here is obviously very similar to that in the Plotinus passage. The gods and god-like men form a privileged society in the universe; the rest of humanity is left outside.⁷ The gods 'receive' those like to them not through any divine condescension but because they (the philosophers) are or have become, by nature and self-training, equal to the gods. In both Epicurus and Plotinus there is the idea of a divine life, exalted above that of common mortals, which gods and good men share, both by right. The gods of Plotinus would have to 'lay aside their own life' if they were to look after the petty affairs of the wicked; the gods of Epicurus are 'intimately concerned with their own virtues' and 'consider everything that is not like themselves as alien'.

From the conception of the community of gods and good men springs, in both Epicurus and Plotinus, an attitude towards the gods which their contemporaries

¹ For Stoic parallels to this cp. *St. vet. Fragm.* III. 606 610.

² III. 2. 13.

³ IV. 4. 26. 40-44.

⁴ *Ein neuer Brief Epikurs*, C. Jensen. Berlin (Weidmann), 1933.

⁵ Jensen, *Text. coll.* I. 1: 20, 26 ff., p. 15; see also p. 78.

⁶ III., To Menoeceus, 12. 4.

⁷ I do not, obviously, wish to suggest that this view implies any lack of φιλανθρωπία, theoretical or practical. It simply involves the irremediable inferiority of the unphilosophical. Even Plotinus, who goes further, only says that the wicked have no claim on the good, not that it is not fitting for the philosopher to practise benevolence. His own life contradicted this last assumption; cp. Porphyry's *Life*, ch. 9.

regard
logical
Epicur
gods d
ence to
for me

TH
was co
Further
is vene
heights
which
attitude
sufficient
be no c
cureani
that he
the clos
order in
resembl
them th
a physic
for Epic
men and
powerle
of men)

WH
significa
the Gre
dicative
Plato, a
scope an
dissimil
not only
understa
phase, a
Epicure
above fr
not lawf
in answe
laying as

¹ Jensen
on Epicur

² Porphy

³ Cp. D.

⁴ Lucr.

cp. Jensen

⁵ Cp. th

phyry's L

⁶ E.g. I

⁷ This

Oriental i

led to the

regarded as arrogant, though it was a natural consequence of the acceptance and logical working out of beliefs which many of those contemporaries shared. Thus Epicurus, in his newly discovered letter, makes Asclepius say, 'You have taught the gods ἀραξία'.¹ Plotinus, when reproached by the pious Amelius with his indifference to religious observances, said, 'It is for Them (the gods) to come to me, not for me to go to Them'.²

There are, of course, important differences between the two men. Epicurus was considerably more pious, in the ordinary sense of the word, than Plotinus.³ Further, he is, in his own opinion and that of his disciples, a saviour,⁴ while Plotinus is venerated by his followers rather as an adept, as one who has attained to the heights of divinity,⁵ without much reference to the spiritual or intellectual benefits which he has conferred upon them. The resemblances, however, both of personal attitude towards the gods and of teaching about their position in the universe, are sufficiently remarkable to make the comparison worth while. There can, of course, be no question of influence of Epicurus upon Plotinus. Plotinus mentions Epicureanism only with hostility⁶ and there is no evidence, and it seems most unlikely, that he had any close acquaintance with it. He would certainly not have admitted the close similarity, in practice, between the relations of gods, men, and the cosmic order in his system and in Epicurus'; and, indeed, we must not exaggerate the resemblance. It stops, of course, at the frontiers of the visible universe; but within them the difference hardly seems to be more than that between a biologist's and a physicist's view of the universe. For Plotinus the visible All is a living creature, for Epicurus a swarm of atoms. For both it is a fixed background against which men and gods, whether star-gods or inhabitants of the *intermundia*, live out their lives, powerless to interfere with the scheme of things, but possessing (at least in the case of men) the power to live well or ill within it.

What we have to deal with is not influence, but something of much more significance, the sharing of a common world-view. It is one by no means alien to the Greek tradition; as Wilamowitz says, 'god' for the Greeks was always a predicative conception; but it seems only to have reached its full development just after Plato, and perhaps under the influence of Oriental ideas of the world-order.⁷ Its scope and strength are shown by the fact that it is present in the systems of two such dissimilar thinkers as Plotinus and Epicurus. It is important to realize its existence, not only for the understanding of post-Aristotelian thought in itself but for the understanding of the polemic against Christianity which characterized its last phase, a polemic in which, though it was conducted by Neo-Platonists, Stoics and Epicureans could have shared. It is difficult to believe that the passage quoted above from the *Περὶ Προνοίας* has not an intentional reference to Christianity. 'It is not lawful for the wicked to expect others to be their saviours, sacrificing themselves, in answer to their prayers; nor that gods should direct the petty details of their life, laying aside their own life. . . .'⁸ Certainly, there could be no better summing up

¹ Jensen, *Text. col.* I., 16-17, p. 15; cp. pp. 80-81 on Epicurus' estimate of his own position.

² Porphyry, *Life of Plotinus*, ch. 10.

³ Cp. Diog. Laert. X. 120.

⁴ Lucr. V. 51, cp. I. 66; Diog. Oinoand. V. 14, cp. Jensen, p. 81.

⁵ Cp. the oracle of Apollo in ch. 22 of Porphyry's *Life*.

⁶ E.g. III. 2. 1.

⁷ This earlier phase of the infiltration of Oriental influences into Greek thought which led to the close connection of Astronomy with

Theology in the Academy must be distinguished from the later, passionate and dominating devotion to the Divine Providence, especially manifested in the order of the heavens, which came in with Zeno of Citium (cp. Cleanthes, *St. vet. Fragm.* I. 527, 537; Epict. *Diss.* I. 6. 23, I. 16, 16, II. 10. 1, IV. 10. 14, etc.); the difference is perhaps more one of tone and emphasis than of doctrine; cp. Bidez, op. cit., esp. pp. 293-294.

⁸ Cp. Julian's objection to the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration and Penance. Caesares, 336 A-B.

of the contrast between the Christian faith and pagan philosophy at its most fully developed and most coherent.¹

A. H. ARMSTRONG.

SWANSEA.

¹ It is impossible here to discuss the differences between Christianity and the pagan world-view sketched above. I would only suggest that they may be seen at their most fundamental (a) by considering the Christian doctrines of the love of God for man and the free gift of grace; and (b) by comparing the benevolence of the philosophers with that 'folly of the Cross', or

inversion of the world's values, which leads the Christian saint to see Christ more clearly in the beggar, the leper, or the fool than in the Philosopher-King himself; and makes him leave the company of the righteous and intelligent to pursue with passionate love the salvation of some highly undesirable sinner.

A N

As
collate
edition
much t
of his
photog
add to
but mo
TI
on pho
error;
predec
my ow
commi

¹ Take
Road, J
Florence

² Pap
λυμικη
require
for ἡν re
(στυγείσθ
read σαφ
read κακ
for ἀγρί
ἀθέτοις r
γὰρ λέχ
φυλάς co
ἐμμενον
Schol. si
these rea
penetrate
with γύα
misreadi
N. Wedd
ed. of th
P. K.

As Dr
and stud
list of po
at varian
LXIV, 41
(sic) ' whe
contained
1172 Ho
πηδῆσας,
teenth co
γ' εἶπας
Univ. N
ἄλλο (Be
(cp. note

A NEW COLLATION OF THE TEXT OF EURIPIDES IN THE JERUSALEM PALIMPSEST.

As stated in C.R. LI, p. 168, the Jerusalem palimpsest of Euripides had been collated by Tischendorf, Papadopoulos Kerameus and Horna. Mr. D. L. Page's edition of the *Medea* takes account of the present collation, which in its turn owes much to the acumen of Mr. Page and to his kindness in allowing me to include some of his results (indicated below by the initials D. L. P.) obtained from independent photographs. Each of the above-named scholars has found reason to correct and add to his predecessor's work, and this is natural, since not only is man not infallible but more and more is also required of a collator as time goes on.

The present collation, which like Dr. Horna's and Mr. Page's has been effected on photographs,¹ has no pretension to absolute completeness or total freedom from error; but I venture to hope that I have succeeded in eliminating some of my predecessors' mistakes and omissions² without having made too many new ones of my own. The task of verification and correction of any such errors of omission or commission is now rendered easier by the presence of photographic reproductions of

¹ Taken and developed by M. Savvidis, Jaffa Road, Jerusalem, and printed by Flli. Alinari, Florence.

² Papadopoulos Kerameus' collation (*Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη*, vol. I, p. 112) appears to require the following corrections:—*Orestes*—598 for ἦν read οὐν—1153 for στυγείσθαι read στυγείν (στυγείσθαι in mrg.)—1155 for 'ἀληθὴς ἀντὶ σαφὴς' read σαφὴς (ἀληθὴς in mrg.)—1159 for κακὸν ἐμὸν read κακὸν ἐμῶν—1169 for ἔσχον read ἔσχε—1367 for ἀργίων read ἀργέων. *Phoenissae*—1639 for ἀθέτοις read ἀθλοῖς—1674 for γὰρ ὁ λέχος read γὰρ λέχος. *Andromacha*—961 for φιλίας read φυλάς corr. in φυλακὰς—for ἐμυνον ὄν' read ἐμυνον (the second ὄν etc. read by P. K. is a Schol. sign)—1045 for γῆν read καί. Most of these readings of Papadopoulos Kerameus have penetrated into Wecklein's apparatus together with γύας for γύας at *Andr.* 1045 (probably a misreading of P. K.'s photograph, p. 112, pl. (2)). N. Wedd's 'Excursus' on this ms (p. 201 of his ed. of the *Orestes*, Cambridge, 1907) also follows P. K.

As Dr. Horna's is the most recent collation and study of the whole text of H, I add below a list of points in which his statements seem to be at variance with the ms evidence (*Hermes*, LXIV, 416-431):—*Hec.*—1141 Horna has 'αἰροῖεν (sic)' where I read αἰροῖαν—1159 ἀμείβουσαι is not contained in B only but in M, L, etc. also—1172 Horna has ἐν δὲ πηδῆσας (I read ἐκ δὲ πηδῆσας.—*Or.*—189 besides F (thirteenth-fourteenth century) several 'school triad' mss have γ' εἶπας (Beck's Mosquensis A), εἶπω (Camb. Univ. Nn, 3, 14=Porson's M), or εἶπας above ἄλλο (Beck's D and another fifteenth-century ms (cp. note 1, p. 200)—746 Horna ἀν' (I read ἐπ'

with P. K.—1159 κακὸν ἐμῶν) (I see no trace of β or α superscr.—1366 βασιλῆων) (βασιλῆων—1367 Horna, following P. K., has ἀργίων) (ἀργέων—1444 [in Dr. Horna's paper the number of this verse is omitted, probably owing to a misprint] ἀ δ' with ἦ superscr.) (no sign of ἦ—1449 σταθμοῖς | ἰππικοῖσι) (σταθμοῖς | ἰππικοῖσι corr. in σταθμοῖς | σιν—1453 ὁμβρίμα ὁμβρίμα is also found in the fifteenth-century ms mentioned in note 1, p. 200, and possibly in others of the same kind—1467 κρατ.) (κράτα, with M: κράτα corr. in κράτα L. κράτα is also the reading of a fifteenth-century Mosquensis according to Beck—πλάγαν is the reading, not of L only, but also of M² and B (prim.): probably of P too since the Aldine has it (I have not myself collated P). One fifteenth-century 'school triad' mss also has it, with an η above each α (see note 1, p. 200)—1468 χρυσο συμβαλὼν ἔχου . . . ὄν) (cp. the collation of H below—1510 the 'aliquot codd.' here referred to by Hermann are doubtless of the same class as the 'Thessalonicensis.' Beck's D and another late fifteenth-century ms have μενέλεων—1539 ἀγγέλουεν) (ἀγγέλλουεν.—*Phoen.*—888 καναστρέψαντες) (κάναστρέψοντας—1660 λάψυθε AB) (λάψυθε ABIP not ABS (i.e. ABLP) as Wecklein—1675 γράφεται μία) (ἔσται μία cp. ἔσται at *Med.* 89.—*Andr.*—130 αἰκέλιον) (αἰκέλιον—1042 ἐπέεσον) (ἐπέεσον.—*Med.*—150 ἀπλάττον) (ἀπλάττον, i.e. ἀπλάττον the tail of τ being too long for τ and the cross-line too low—162 ἐνδοσαμένη) (ἐνδοσαμένη with P. K.—245 καρδιαν δσση) (καρδιαν δσση.—*Hipp.*—505 λέγεις is not a mere iotacism here: it is part of the reading δὴ λέγεις instead of δ' ἦν λέγεις (see the collation).

the Euripidean text of this ms in the following public libraries: University Library, Cambridge; Trinity College Library, Cambridge; Bodleian Library, Oxford; Library of the British Museum, London; John Rylands Library, Manchester; Library of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, London; National Library of Wales, Aberystwyth; Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.; Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn., U.S.A.; Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris; Preussische Staatsbibliothek, Berlin; R. Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Florence; R. Biblioteca di San Marco, Venice; Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vatican City; Library of the Department of Antiquities, Jerusalem. The original is of course preserved in the Library of the Greek Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, where it bears the catalogue number Σάββα 36. The Convent also possesses a copy of the reproduction.

The constitution of the original Euripidean ms would appear to have been as follows, at least for those plays parts of which have survived: it may of course originally have contained others as well. Quaternions: (2) *Hec.* 1-818-9. *Hec.* 819-*Phoen.* 1049-(1) *Phoen.* 1050-1449-1. *Phoen.* 1450-end+3 pp.—1. 3 pp.+*Andr.* 1-319-(1) *Andr.* 320-736-2. *Andr.* 737-end+9 pp.—1. 2 pp.+*Med.* 1-355-(2) *Med.* 356-1127-1. *Med.* 1128-end+4 pp.—2. 7 pp.+*Hipp.* 1-618-(1) *Hipp.* 619-1035-1. *Hipp.* 1036-1436-(1) *Hipp.* 1437-end+14 pp.: total, 26 quaternions. Assuming the usual order for *Hec.*, *Or.*, *Phoen.*, by counting pages we find an interval of 11 pp. between *Hec.* and *Or.* and one of 6 pp. between *Or.* and *Phoen.* Adopting the above distribution we also find intervals of 6 pp. between *Phoen.* and *Andr.* and of 11 pp. each between *Andr.* *Med.* and *Med.* *Hipp.* Different distributions of the last three plays would lead to the following intervals: *Andr.* *Med.* *Hipp.*, 6-16-16: *Hipp.* *Med.* *Andr.*, 10-16-7: *Hipp.* *Andr.* *Med.*, 10-17-11: *Med.* *Hipp.* *Andr.*, 5-11-17: *Med.* *Andr.* *Hipp.*, 5-7-16. The order of the plays in our ms would therefore appear to have been (as already given by Horna) *Hec.*, *Or.*, *Phoen.*, *Andr.*, *Med.*, *Hipp.*

Among other surviving mss this order only occurs, so far as I know, in A (Par. 2712), whose textual similarity to H has already been pointed out by Horna.

As regards the hands of the scribe and correctors, I have indicated the former by H and the latter by H₁, H₂. In some minor corrections I do not find it easy to tell the difference, but H₁ is very near to H and probably often identical with him. H₂ seems later, but not much later: the use of the ms as a palimpsest in the twelfth¹ or thirteenth² century has preserved the underlying text from subsequent alterations.

Owing to the fact that the codex consists of separate leaves folded and sewn together more or less close to the edges, it sometimes happens that some verses are hidden by the fold where the leaf has been sewn, and these are not visible in the reproduction.³ A direct collation, which will have to be undertaken again sooner or later, would allow of their being examined to some extent.

The third 'union' of the codex is missing at Jerusalem. It was torn out by Porphyrios Uspensky and taken by him to Russia, where it formed part of the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg with the number 261.⁴ I do not know whether this fragment contains any Euripides or if it has ever been collated.

On pp. 313, 314, and to a lesser degree on pp. 339, 340, the underlying writing

¹ Coxe and Tischendorf, ap. Papadopoulos Kerameus, 'Γερμανομνητική Βιβλιοθήκη', vol. I, p. 109.

² Papadopoulos Kerameus, l.c.

³ The following verses are thus hidden by the binding fold in the reproduction on which the present collation has been made: *Hec.* 1149-*Or.* 565, 592, 742-3, 1356-7 1383-4, 1509, 1533-5, most of 1536 and part of 1537-*Phoen.* 1626, 1651-2, 1676-*Andr.* part of 80, 145, 912 and part of 913, 937, 962-*Med.* 101-2 and part of 103,

126-7, 154-6 (μηδὲν-σεβίγει), 179-182 and part of 183-*Hipp.* 1136, 1161, 1290. P. 313A is noted in the Index to the reproduction as containing *Med.* 1356-1376. This is wrong: it should read 1351-1376. Verses 1351-1355 are however practically illegible. The photographs used by Dr. Horna allowed him to note the omission of *τε* *Or.* 1535 and *γε* *Phoen.* 1652 and the reading *σπεύσαι* *Med.* 183.

⁴ Cp. Papadopoulos Kerameus, *oc.*, p. 109 note.

has al
therefo
occur

T
receptu
varian
far as
A

¹ *Hec.*
1901: C
Weckle
Med. ed.
Hipp. e
1926).

² For
which
followi
inserted
has πλ
mention
δισσὴ μ
δενά L
193 μα
in Weck
πολλῇ
δπα (no
mention
χοῦ L
mention
(not π
mention
or L² (π
πᾶσιν α
(not ἐν
μεταμει
δυσδαμ
λάξυθε
τάμ' ἐγ
by 1 (n
πέδω (n
mention
μασιν b
made in
parently
changed
pendium
videtur
added L
λαίνα ad
785 ταύ
tioned)-
lus L)-
(not ἐστ
(not me
γενέλον
δῶμασιν
into ἀπ
84 κακὸ
with σκε
—108 ἐρ
L² (not

has almost vanished in many places, and the readings given for these pages are therefore of varying degrees of certainty. Some variant readings almost certainly occur here which have escaped me.

The readings of H are given in this collation where H differs from the *textus receptus* as contained in Prinz-Wecklein's edition.¹ Other passages where there are variants mentioned in Wecklein have been checked by reference to the facsimiles as far as L (Laur. pl. 32, 2)² and M (Ven. Marc. 471)³ are concerned.

A revision of the existing collations of M and L would appear to be advisable.

¹ *Hec.* ed. altera quam curavit N. Wecklein, 1901: *Or.* ed. N. Wecklein, 1900: *Phoen.* ed. N. Wecklein, 1901: *Andr.* ed. N. Wecklein, 1900: *Med.* ed. altera quam curavit N. Wecklein, 1899: *Hipp.* ed. N. Wecklein, 1900 (anastatice iteratum 1926).

² For that portion of the text of Euripides which corresponds to the contents of H, the following corrections as to readings of L may be inserted in Wecklein's apparatus:—*Hec.* 890 L has *πασθεΐσα* in an erasure of which there is no mention in Wecklein—897 *δισσῇ μερίμνα* L (not *δισσῇ μερίμνα*)—1169 *δεῖν* changed to *δελν* by l (not *δεῖν* L)—*Or.* 142 *ἀποπρόβατε* (not *ἀπόπροβᾶτ*)—193 *ματρός* (not *ματέρος*)—316 *αἰ* *αἰ* (not mentioned in Wecklein)—349 *πολλῇ δ'* (not *πολλῇ δ'* vel *πολλῇ δ'*)—359 *οὐκ* *πὸτ'* (not mentioned)—723 *παῖ* (not *παῖ*)—748 *φίλοι* (not *φίλοις*)—757 *ἦ* (not mentioned)—759 *νῦν* (not mentioned)—760 *πανταχοῦ* L (not only P)—1373 *φρούδα φρούδα* (not mentioned)—1399 *αἰδαο* (not *αἰδαο*)—1406 *πολέμω* (not *πολέμω*)—1467 *κράτα* corr. to *κράτα* (no mention)—1468 *χρυσεοσάνδαλον*: *αν* on erasure l or L² (no mention)—1518 *πᾶσιν φρυξιν ἦν*: *ν* of *πᾶσιν* added by l (not *ν* pro *ἦν*)—1528 *οὐτ'* *αν* (not *εν* om.)—*Phoen.* 831 *μεταμειβομένα* (not *μεταμειβόμενα*)—842 *τίς* (not mentioned)—1601 *δυσδαίμνα* (not *δυσδαίμονα*)—1660 *λάξ** L and *λάξυσε* l on the erasure (not *λάξυσε* L)—1685 *τᾶμ' ἐγὼ*: only the accent on *a* being rewritten by l (not the whole *τᾶμ' ἐγὼ* rewritten)—1687 *πέδω* (not *πέδω*)—1689 *ὄλω* rewritten by l (not mentioned)—*Andr.* 92 *δακρύμασι* made into *δακρύμασιν* by L² or l (not *δακρύμασιν* L)—103 *ἐπεινᾶ* made into *αἰπεινᾶ* by l (not *αἰπεινᾶ* L)—111 apparently *ἐλίπον* (not *ἐλειπον*)—*Andr.* 138 *φίλους* changed into *φίλον* (not *φίλον* L sed *compendium* (=ον) ex alio compendio correctum videtur)—140 *τάλαινα* with *ω* *παν* apparently added before *τάλαινα* by l (not *ω* ante *παντάλαινα* add. l)—153 apparently *ἐθνοῖς* (not *ἐθνοῖς*)—785 *ταῦτ' αν ἦνεσα* corr. to *ταῦταν* l (not mentioned)—798 *ἴνις* changed to *ἴνις* by l or L² (not *ἴνις* L)—944 *ἐστίν* accent ' on *i* added by l or L² (not *ἐστίν* L)—1076 * with *α* *α*, in erasure, by l (not mentioned)—*Med.* 65 *προσγυελον* (not *προσγυελον*)—77 *δύμασι* with *ν* added in erasure (not *δύμασιν* L)—78 apparently *ἀπωλόμεθ'* *θ'* changed into *ἀπωλόμεθ'* (not *ἀπωλόμεθ'* mut. in *-εσθ'*)—84 *κακὸς γ'* (not *κακὸς γ'*)—85 *γινώσκεις τῶδε* with *σκεῖς τῶδε* in erasure (no mention of erasure)—108 *ἐργάσεται* changed into *ἐργάσεται* by L¹ or L² (not *ἐργάσεται* 'mut. ipse in *σ'*)—121 *μετα-*

βάλλουσι with *ν* added apparently by L² or l (not *μεταβάλλουσι* L)—122 *ἴσοισι* with *ν* added apparently by L² or l (not *ἴσοισιν* L)—135 *μέλαθρον* (not *μέλαθρο**)—205 *βοᾷ* corr. by l into *βοᾷ* (not mentioned)—244 *ξυνῶν* corr. to *συνῶν* (not *συνῶν* L)—1288 *ὑπερτείν** corr. to *ὑπερτείνασα* (not mentioned)—*Hipp.* 351 *δς τίς* (not mentioned)—362 *ω* . . . *ω* (not *ω* . . . *ω*)—364 * *αν* but with *σαν* *φίλαν* over the erasure by L¹ (not *σαν* *φίλαν* L)—480 *ἦ τ' ἄρα* with *ἦ* changed to *ἦ* by l (not *ἦ τ' ἄρα* L)—507 *τῶ* *εἰ* apparently, on an erasure (not mentioned)—1294 *ὡς τοῖς* (not *εν τοῖς*)—1314 *οἰμῶξας* changed into *οἰμῶξης* by l (not *οἰμῶξης* sed *ης* corr. vel rescr. l').

³ For that portion of the text of Euripides which corresponds to the contents of H, the following corrections as to readings of M may be inserted in Wecklein's apparatus:—*Hec.* 878 *τινί* (not *τίνι*)—897 *δισσ** *μερίμν[α]* corrected into *δισσῶ μερίμνα* (not *δισσ** *μερίμνα* M)—1139 *ξυνοικήση* (not *ξυνοικήση*)—*Or.* 164 *ἐδίδασεν* (not mentioned)—173 *ὑπνώσει* with *ττ* written above *σ* by M² (not mentioned)—181 no trace of *χο* or *ηλ* in prim. M, both being added by M² (not 'Electrae notam, etc.')—314 *νοστήσης* all on one line (not *νοστή* superscr. *σῆς*)—315 *γίνεται* (not mentioned)—316 *αἰ* *αἰ* (not mentioned)—330 *ἐλακεν ἐλακεν* (not *ἐλακεν ἐλακε*)—343 *κατέκλυσε* (not mentioned)—359 *οὐκ* *πὸτ'* (not mentioned)—391 *σῆ* changed into *σῆ* without erasing *i* adscr. (not *σῆ*)—566 *ἤξουσι* corr. into *ἤξουσι* by M² (not *ἤξουσι* M)—602 *καθεστᾶσι* (no mention)—746 *θανόντ' ὑπ'* (no mention)—757 apparently *ἦ* corr. by M² into *ἦ* (no mention)—765 *ἦλασε* changed into *ἦλασέν μ'* by M² (no mention)—766 *ἐγκλήματι* (not *ἐγκληματι*)—912 *γίνεται* (no mention)—915 *δ'* (not *δέ*)—1359 *τοῦ* (no mention)—1368 *πενσόμεθα* (not *ut vid.*): M always makes the slight enlargement at the left-hand end of the cross-stroke of *θ*: it is not a *σ*)—1391 *τλάμων*: for the space available for the letter *ω* see *λαλέμων* just above (not *τλάμω**)—1393 *αὐθ' ἕκαστ' αν* (not *αὐθ' ἕκαστ' αν*)—1398 *ξίφει* (not mentioned)—1415 *ἐβαλλον ἐβαλλον* (not 'superscr.')—1467 *κράτα* (no mention)—1468 *χρυσεοσάμβαλον* with *β* corr. into *δ* by M², the accent above *ον* erased and the one above *σ* deleted (no mention)—1484 *ἄρεως* corr. into *ἄρεος* by M² (not *ἄρεος* M)—1525 *με* (no mention)—*Phoen.* 817 *γρ. σῶναιμος* (not *γρ. σῶναιμον*)—824 *ἀνέσταν* the final *ν* erased (not *ἀνέστα**)—842 *τίς* (no mention)—852 *γῶν* (not *γ' οὐν*)—no trace of *γρ. ν'* is visible on the facsimile—870 *αἵματοποιούς* *δρα* with *ους* *δρα* erased. Cp. *Or.* 256

Such a revision might probably include with advantage all the other mss of Euripides which we possess. This is a task too onerous for any single scholar to undertake, but a small committee (aided by the facsimiles already in existence (M, L and H), those in course of reproduction (e.g. B) or which it is hoped shortly to produce (e.g. A and P+G) and others which may be produced in the course of the next few years) should be able to revise the collations of all the principal Euripidean mss in a relatively short space of time and give future editors a firmer basis for their text than has hitherto been available. A thorough comparison of the numerous so-called 'Byzantine' mss of the 'school triad' (*Hec.*, *Or.*, *Phoen.*) would lead to some sort of classification of this scarcely explored mass, and the evidence thus obtained as to its derivations might be of interest for indicating the nature of lost elements in that stemma which still defies compilation. Examination of the text of the *Hecuba* in one such ms shows several instances of readings differing from those called 'rec.' in Wecklein's apparatus and agreeing with the readings called 'vet.'¹ The sixteenth-century ms at Salonica collated by P. N. Pappageorgiou ('*Aθηναῖον*, 1881) also shows some notable variants, some of which are given by Wecklein under the symbol 't'. This is what one would expect, since all these mss were naturally not copied from the same original, and it is here that a classification might lead to interesting results. So far as I know no reasonably complete list of the 'Byzantine' mss exists, but an attempt is now being made to compile one.

COLLATION.

Hecuba vv. 869-893 (ms p. 282B):—870 εἴ τι—873 τοῖα ut vid.—877 γραίη om.—879 τί σοι—888 μέθος.

vv. 894-920 (ms p. 281A):—897 διςσὼ μεριμνα—899 τήνδε[.]δοῦναι fere 1 lit. spat.—907 τοῖον (conj. King)—911 αἰθάλον καπνοῦ—912 κέχρησθαι H: κέχρωσαι H₂—913 ἐμβατεύω—915 ἦμος δ' ἐκ—ὑπνος om. H: superscr. H₂—916 μολπὰν—χ*ροποιῶν H: χοροποιόν H₂.

vv. 1125-1148 (ms p. 281B):—1130 λέγε—1139 συνοικήση—1141 αἶριοιαν δόρυ H: in mrg. γρ. στόλον H₂—1146 ἡγαγεν (ut vid.) corr. in ἡγεν—1147 φράσσουσα.

vv. 1149-1173 (ms p. 282A):—1151 χεῖρες—1152 φίλω* ut vid., ν in ι mutata—1153 θάκουν—ἡδωνε*s corr. in ἡδωνῆς—1154 ἡίνουν θ'—1155 καμάκαν sed ν eras.—

θρηκίαν—1158 ἔπαλον—1159 διαδοχαῖσιν—χεροῖν—1162 πολεμίων—1163 τας γ'—1165 ἐξανασταίην—1167 ἦν*ον (ἦνντον conj. Porson)—1172 ἐκ.

Orestes vv. 105-129 (ms p. 358B):—105 εἰσβλέψαι—107 ἐκπέμψεις—108 εἰς—109

αἱματωπὸς καὶ δρακοντῶδεις (αἱματωδεις corr. to αἱματωπὸς M) (not 'post αἱματωποι 5 fere lit. eras.').—871 καπνὸςδεῖξιν with ν changed into s (not καπνὸςδεῖξιν M)—884 πόλει changed into πόλι by M² (not πόλι M)—1690 δεῖ καμὲ (not δεῖ καμὲ)—οὐκοῦν (not οὐκοῦν)—1692 γενναία* (not γενναίαι)—*Andr.* 105 τροίαν (not τροία*)—820 προσπόλων changed into πρὸς πόλων by M¹ (not πρὸς πόλων M)—824 as 820—898 μόνη (not μονη)—944 ἐστι (not ἐστι)—951 κληθροῖσι (not κληθροῖσι)—1045 γύας (not γύας)—1068 τάνδανθ' (not τάνθανδ')—1070 ὦ μοι μοι (no mention)—1076 αἶ αἶ (no mention)—1084 ἀκοῦσ' changed into ἀκοῦστ' by M² (not ἀκοῦστ' M)—1087 ἐξεπύπλαμμεν (not ἐξεπύπλαμμεν)—*Hipp.* 349 εἰ μὲν (not εἴμεν)—350 φῆς (no mention)—351 οὐ τις (no mention)—362 ὦ . . . ὦ (not ὦ . . . ὦ)—1182 ταῦτ' ἀλλ' ὡς πιστέον (no mention). Besides these variants from Wecklein, M also has a small note not mentioned by Schwartz: *Or.* 188 after ἄλλο and on the same line (i.e. Mj) περισσὸς ὁ τε referring to οὗτε on l. 189.

¹ The ms in question, in my possession, was apparently copied in North Italy about the end of the fifteenth century, as is indicated by the watermarks in the paper on which it is written. In the following list the first reading is that of the fifteenth-century ms, the second the reading attributed to 'rec.' in Wecklein's apparatus. In all these cases the fifteenth-century ms agrees with those called 'veteres libri' by Wecklein (in which he includes L).

Hec. 94 ἀχιλλέως(ἀχιλλέως—116 συνέπες(συνέπαισε—128 ἀχιλλέας(ἀχιλλέας—164 δαιμόνων(δαίμων—209 ὑποπεμπομένην(ὑπὸ πεμπομένην—231 μ' ἐχρήν(με χρήν—335 ῥιφέντες(ῥιφθέντες—454 πεδία(τὰς γύας—501 ἐᾷ(ἐᾷς—535 and 605 μου(μοι—598 διέφθειρ(διέφθορ)—1025 ἐμπεσὼν(πεσὼν—1033 ἰὼ(ἰὼ—1078 φονίαν(φονίαν—1195 ὠδ' ἐν(ὠδε—*Or.* 1544 φόνου(πόνου. This ms had μενέλεων at *Or.* 1510 but the final ν is erased. Similar mss are doubtless those here referred to by Hermann as 'aliquot codices' (cp. note 2, p. 197).

τεθνηκυ
ἀργείων
vv.

corr. in
ἐκείσε—
vv.

χαράν—
ὑπνώσει
179 ἀγα
λ
η H₂—
φυλασσ
vv.

γε εἴπα
hic sed
ἡλέκτρα
vv.

—321
332 ἰδ—
vv.

κατέκλυ
H₁—34
sup. η s

vv.
—368
ἐξέλιποι
vv.

δ' om.—
τάφωι—
vv.

εἰς—56
—575
vv.

ἀν οὖν
οὐκ ἀκού
vv.

vv.
ναντίλοι
740 ἐφο
vv.

ἐτόλμησ
πανταχ
sup. ι s

vv.
τ'—899
—911
vv.

literae
vv.

στυγείσ
1158
1175 δ

τεθνηκύνῃ 111 πέμφομαι (fort. πέμφομαι)—114 κλυταιμνήστρας—119 ἀργείων (fort. ἀργείων)—εὐμενῇ—νιν (conj. Nauck)—121 ἀπώλεσε—122 ἐμὴν—128 παρ'.

vv. 130-154 (ms p. 357A):—131 θ' om. H: superscr. H₁—140 σίγα σίγα—λε...δν

corr. in λεπτόν—141 τιθεῖτε—μὴ κτυπεῖτε μηδ' ἔστω κτύπος—142 ἀποπροβάτ'—143 ἐκείσε—145 ἃ ἃ—147 ὑπώροφον—148 βοάν—154 ἥλ ante vers.

vv. 155-184 (ms p. 533B):—155-6 ante vers. personae nota?—155 ἀναστένει—159

χαράν—160 ὦ μέλεος—161 ὦ τάλας—162 ἡ ὦ ἄδικος—171 ἐλίζεις H: ἐλίζεις H₂—173 ὑπνώσει H: alterum σ superscr. H₂—174 nulla personae nota—175 πολυστόνων—179 ἀγαμεμόνειον—180 ὑπὸ τε γὰρ ἀλγέων—181 διοιχόμεσθ' οἰχόμεσθα—ante κτύπον add. ἡ H₂—nulla personae nota ante σίγα—σίγαγα H qui ipse alterum σί superscr.—182 φυλασσομένα: ut vid., φίλ corr. in φυλ.

vv. 185-213 (ms p. 534A):—185 ἀνὰ κέλαδον—ἀπὸ—186 χαράν—ὦ φίλα—188 ἄλλο

γε εἴπας corr. in ἄλλο γ' εἴπας—189 οὔτε—190 ἀρ'—193 ματέρος—194 δίκαια—ἡ non hic sed ante ἐκάνες—199 τε om.—204 στονάχῃσι—206 ἐπὶ δ'—207 εἰς—208 παροῦσ' ἡλέκτρα παρθένε—212 γε.

vv. 313-337 (ms p. 534B):—314 νοσήσης—315 γίνεται—316 αἶ αἶ sic acc. ut vid.—321 μελαχρύτες—329 ἀπόφασιν—ὁ φοῖβος om.—330 ἔλακεν ἔλακεν—331 μυχοὶ γὰς—332 ἰὼ—337 εἰς—δόμον.

vv. 338-362 (ms p. 533A):—338 ὅς—340 οὐ μόνιμος H: ἐν βροτοῖς add H₁—343 κατέκλυσε—344 κύμασιν—345 ἄλλον om.—347 με χρή—348 ὦδε—δεῖ H: corr. in δῆ H₁—349 πολλὸν δ'—352 ὀρήσας sed η ιotae simillima—353 εἰς—358 ἐιλιχθῆσαν H: sup. η scr. εἰ H₁—ἀθλίοις—359 οὔπω πότ'—360 ἡπιστάμην—362 προσίσχω—πρῶραν.

vv. 363-387 (ms p. 357B):—364 μάντις (in loco Γλαῦκος)—365 τόδ'—367 πανυστάτοις—368 δ' om.—373 ἀλκίτύπων—376 δεῖν'—377 κλυταιμνήστρας—378 ἐξέλκον (fort. ἐξέλιπον)—μολών—380 ὦδ'—381 μὴνύσω—382 δὲ om. ?—384 αὐτός—εἰς—385 λείσω.

vv. 388-412 (ms p. 358A):—389 λεύσεις—390 οὐ λελοιπὲ με—391 παράλογόν—394 δ' om.—εἰς ἐμὲ—395 ἀπόλλυσιν—397 φῆις—400 μητρός θ'—402 τάλαιναν μητέρ' ἐξωκονν τάφωι—405 ὠρθευε—406 γ' om.—407 ἐκ φασμάτων—408 περιφέρεις—409 ὀνομάζειν.

vv. 565-588 (ms p. 524B):—566 εἰς—ut vid., ἔξουσι mut. in ἔξουσι—θάρσους—568 εἰς—569 ἦν αὐταῖς—571 ὥς σὺ κομπεῖς δεινὰ—573 ἀπόντα δωμάτων—574 γῆν mut. in γῆ.—575 ἔωσεν—576 ο.. αὐτῇ—580 τὸν—ματέρος—585 γέρων—586 γὰρ τὸ—θάρσος.

vv. 592-614 (ms p. 523A):—593 πειθόμεθα—594 πειθόμενος—596 χρή—598 ποῖ τίς ἂν οὖν ἔτι φύγοι—602 καθεστᾶσι—609 ἀνάξει—ἐλθεῖν—610 δ' om.—611 οὐνεκ'—613 οὐκ ἄκονσαν—ἀνασείω.

vv. 718-741 (ms p. 523B):—718 τᾶλλα δ' οὐδὲν—κακιστέ συ—723 ὅπη—728 ναυτίλοισι γαλήνης—729 μεχρὴν—δι' αἰστος—732 φίτατ'—736 εἰς ἐμὲ—737 γίνεσθαι—740 ἐφουράθη ut vid.

vv. 742-766 (ms p. 524A):—746 θανόντ' ἐπ'—748 εὐλαβεῖθ'—749 εἰς—μαθεῖν—753 ἐτόλμησε—755 γὰρ—757 ἦ—758 μῦθος δ'—759 νῦν—760 φυλασσόμεθα—φρουρίοις πανταχῇ—761 αἰστος—τεύχεσι—763 προσοίσῃ corr. ut vid. in προσείῃ—765 στρόφις: sup. ι scr. ο—ἥλασε—μεν.

vv. 897-921 (ms p. 343B):—897 πόλεως corr. ras. in πόλεος—ἐν ἔτ' corr. ras. in ἐν τ'—899 σ' οὐδὲ—900 ὁσιούν—901 δ' om.—906 αἰστος (conj. Valckenaer)—907 ἡδὺς τοῖς—911 ὦδε δεῖ—912 ὁμοῖον—γίνεται—916 κατακτείναντι.

vv. 922-946 (ms p. 344A):—922 ἀνεπίπληκτον habuit ut vid. primitus H sed literae πληκ partim eras.—929 φθείρουσιν—936 φθάνοιτε τᾶν—944 λέγων.

vv. 1152-1175 (ms p. 344B):—1152 σεσωσμένοι—1153 στυγείν in text. et in mrg στυγείσθαι—1154 κατήσχυε—γένος—1155 σαφής et in mrg. ἀληθής—1157 ἀντάλαγμα—1158 ἐξείρες—1159 κακῶν ἐμῶν—1161 ἐμποδῶν—παῖσομαι—1167 πέφυκ'—1169 ἔσχεν—1175 ὁ βούλομαι γὰρ.

vv. 1176-1200 (ms p. 343A):—1181 δὴ νῦν—1183 εἰρόμην—1185 κλυταμνήστρας—1188 τι τοῦτο μ' εἶπες—εἰς—1190 εἶπες—1196 μενέλεως—1198 κρατῇ—1200 εἰ—in mrg. γρ. καὶ νῦν.

vv. 1356-1382 (ms p. 372B):—1359 λόγων—τοῦ—πυθόμεθα—1360 τὰς . . . τὰς—συμφορὰς—1361 εἰς—1363 ἐπλησεν—1366 κλείθρα—βασιλίων H: βασιλείων H₂—1367 ἡλέ prae f.—ἐκβαίνει ἀργείων φρυγῶν—1368 πευσόμεθα—1370 βαρβάρους ἐν εὐμαρίσιν—1371 τέρεμνα—1373 φρούδα φρούδα—1375 ξένοι H: ξένοι H₂—1379 κυκλεῖ—1380 ἔστ'—1382 καὶ om.

vv. 1383-1407 (ms p. 371A):—1389 ἐρινῶν—ὅττοῖ τοί: ὅ (i.e. τι) eras.—1391 τλάμων—1392 ἱπποσύνη ut vid.—1396 αἱ αἱ—1397 φοναῖ corr. in φωναῖ sed o sup. ω add. H₁—1398 ὅτ' ἀν—ξίφεσι—1399 αἶδα—1400 εἰς δόμους—1402 ἐκκληῖζέτο—1403 κακομήτας—ἀνὴρ om.—1405 ἐς.

vv. 1408-1440 (ms p. 390B):—1414 χείρας—1415 ἔβαλλον ἔβαλλον—1423 τὴν—1427 αὔραν αὔραν H: αὔραν αὔραν H₁—1428 ἐπὶ πηγῇ—1429 αἰσῶν—1430 νόμοισι—1431 ἢ δὲ—ἡλικάτα—ἐλίσσεν—1433 νῆμαθ' ἔτεο—1436 κλυταμνήστρα—1437 προσεῖπε.

vv. 1441-1464 (ms p. 389A):—1444-5 ἐφείπετ' οὐ—1445 παθεῖν add. H₂ post ἔμελλεν—1446 ἰὼν—1447 αἰεὶ—1448 ἐκλήϊσε—1449-50 σταθμοῖς in corr. in σταθμοῖσιν—1450 ἐν (2 fere lit. spat., fort. ras.) ἐδραῖσι—1452 ἐγένετο—1453 μᾶτερ semel—ὀμβρίμα ὀμβρίμα—αἶ αἶ—1458 ἐκ—ἄλλον ἄλλοσε.

vv. 1465-1487 (ms p. 389B):—1465 ἀνίαχεν bis—1467 κράτα—πλαγάν—1468

φνῶ—χρύσειον ἀμβαλὼν H: ν in σ, μβ in νδ corr. H₁: in mrg. γρ. χρυσεοσάμβαλον—ὄν (sic) post ἔχνος (fort. *ον sed non τὸν)—1469 ἐς—1472 λαιμὸν—ποῦ δῆτ'—1473 δωμάτων—1474 ἐμβαλόντες—1478 ἦλθε—1481 πριαμίσι—1485 ἐγενόμην.

vv. 1488-1508 (ms. p. 390A):—1491 ἔτεκε—1492 δραμόντες—1507 βαρβάρους—προσπίπτων.

vv. 1509-1532 (ms p. 371B):—1510 μενέλεων—1513 θανείν—1515 αὐτοῖσι—1516 κτανῶ—1518 σίδαρος—1520 πέτρος H: πετρᾶς H₁—ἐσιδῶν—1523 δούλων—1524 εἴσω—1525 με—1526 μεταβουλευσόμεθα—1528 ἀνδράσι corr. ut vid. in ἀνδράσιν—1529 οὐνεκ'—1531 μενέλεων—εἴσω.

vv. 1533-1556 (ms p. 372A):—1537 αὐ om.—1539 ἀγγέλλομεν H: ω sup. o scr. H₁—εἰς—1540 ἔχομεν—1545 βροτοῖσι—1546 ὅπα—θέλη—1547 ἀλαστώρων—1548 ἔπεσεν ἔπεσσε—1549 χο prae f.—λείσω.

Phoenissae vv. 811-829 (ms p. 539B):—814 οὐ μὴ mut. in ὅ μὴ—817 σὺναιμον—εἰς—818 γαῖ ut vid.—823 ἦλθον—826 ἀμπεδίον H; ἃ superscr. H₂—828 ἀκερόεσσα.

vv. 830-853 (ms p. 540A):—831 μεταμειομένα (sic)—832 ἔστακ'—ἀρηῖοις—836 εἰς—πεδίον—838 τέμει—742 τίς—ἡπίλοιπος—ἄσπετος—843 ὥς τ'—845 σοῖσι—846 δ' om.—849 ἐν σπονδῇ—852 πάρεμι—γ' οὐν.

vv. 854-877 (ms p. 540B):—865 οὐνεκ'—κληῖσας—868 τεκνώθη—871 ἐλλάδος—874 γέρας.

vv. 878-899 (ms p. 539A):—878 τί δρῶν ὁποῖα—879 in mrg. ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς ὄχλον—881 νεκροῖς—884 συγκατασκάπτῃ—πόλει—885 λόγοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς τις—888 κάνασ-τρέφοντας—889 τὸ κακὸν ἔστι—896 αὐτοῦ—897 δ'—898 φράσσον.

vv. 1600-1625 (ms p. 331B):—1601 δυσδαίμονα—1602 θανείνιν—1606 διώλεσεν—1609 εἰς—1613 ὅμματα· εἰς τ'—1616 φίλου—1619 βίον—1620 ἀποκτενείς—1622 ἐλίξας—γ' om.

vv. 1626-1650 (ms p. 332A):—1629 νῆ et in mrg. τὸ δὲ πολυνείκους νεκρόν—1631

κηρύξετε—1634 ἄκλαυστον—1637 εἰσιούσαν H: εἰς mut. in εἶπ H₂—1638 μενεῖ (fort. μενεῖ)—1639 ἀθλόις—1643 τύραννον—1647 ἐπείθου—1650 κνῶ.

vv. 1651-1675 (ms p. 332B):—1653 οὐκ οὐν—1654 νῦν—1656 ἀνὴρ—1658 ἀρ—1660 κεῖς—1662 ἃ σοι—1664 τῷ ὑγρᾶν (sic)—1666 τύχης—1674 πολλῇ ὅτ' ἀνάγκη· ποῖ φεύξῃ γὰρ λέχος H: corr. in πολλῇ τ' H₁ (πολλῇ 'στ' conj. Hartung)—1675 ἀρ—μία.

vv. 1676-1700 (ms p. 331A):—1684 εἰ—1687 sup. πεσὼν scr. γρ. θανῶν—ὅπα—

1689 μ
ἀλλήλο

δακρύμ
νν

—110
μένα—

νν
παρὸν—

135 ἴσ
Nauck

νν
—161

νν
o scr. I

sup. ο
ξυμπλη

θερ pra
νν

ἀλγεί—

828 θέ
νν

H: su

χρήμα
νν

929 ὀρε
νν

μὲν—9
954 εἰς—

νν
972 σόι

ράδιον—

νν
γύας—

δεινόν.
νν

vid. ἀμ
ἀρα—εἰ

M

πρε ut
νν

—84 κ
τοῖς δέ

θᾶπτον.
νν

τλήμων·
μὴ μεγά

νν
131 φω

grave)—
μῦθος α

νν

1689 μ' om.—1690 οὐκ οὖν—δεῖ καμὲ—πόνων—1693 πρόσταγε—1694 γεραιᾶς—1698 τὸ δ'—ἀλλήλων.

Andromacha vv. 80-103 (ms p. 422B):—80 γ' om.—86 σμικρὰ—91 ἐγκείμεθ'—92 δακρύματι—95 αἰεῖ—99 εἰσπεσοῦσ'—100 γυναικ. praef.—103 αἰπεινᾶι.

vv. 104-122 (ms p. 421A):—105 δὴ ἄλωτὸν—109 ἀγομαι H: ἀγόμαν H₂—θαλάσσης—110 ἀμφιβαλῶσα H: v sup. o scr.—111 ἐλίπον—113 ὧμοι—μ' ἐχρῆν—114 ὑποτερομένα—119 ἀσητίδα.

vv. 122-144 (ms p. 421B):—122 συνεκλήυσαν—123 τλάμονα—124 οὔσαν—126 τὸ παρὸν—128 ἐυγενέταισι—130 ποντίου—τίς—131 ἀτυζομέναν—ἀεικέλιον—133 σε πείσει—135 ἴσθι—138 τίν'—142 δεσποτῶν δ' ἐμῶν φόβῳ (δεσποτῶν φόβῳ δ' ἐμῶν conj. olim. Nauck)—144 τυγχάνω.

vv. 145-169 (ms p. 422A):—145 ἴδῃ—153 ἔδνοις—154 τοιοῦσδ'—159 ἡπειρωτῆς—εἰς—161 καὶ οὐδὲν—163 σ' om.—167 χ***: ut vid., χειρὶ mut. in χειρσὶ—169 χρυσός.

vv. 777-805 (ms p. 446B):—778 νίκαν H: sup. i scr. ei H₁—780 φόνῳ H: θ sup. o scr. H₁—τὸ σφάλλειν—784 sup. ξηρὸν scr. ἀφανὲς—785 τοῦτ' ἂν ἦνευσα ut vid. H: α sup. ou scr. H₁—791 καὶ κεῖται οὖρον mut. in -ρων—793 ἄξιον ὑγρὰν—794 ποντίαν ξυμπληγάδα—800 ἔχων H. o sup. ω scr. H₁—τ' εὐρώταν H: mut. in εὐρώπαν H₁—802 θερ praef.—κακῶι.

vv. 806-830 (ms p. 445A):—809 ἀποσταλεῖ—810 θανεῖν—812 εἰργοῦσι—814 μέγ' ἀλγὰ—816 ἔργουσδ'—819 εὐπειθέστεροι—821 ἀγγέλλονσα—822 σθένει—825 ἰὼ μοι μοι—828 θέ praef.—829 αἰ αἰ αἰ αἰ.

vv. 887-911 (ms p. 435B):—889 σπαρτιάτης—890 ἐστὶ—892 γονάτων—894 δ' om. H: superscr. H₁ ut vid.—895 γόνασ' ὠλένας—897 τήνδε—898 γε τυνδαρίς—901 τί χρῆμα πρὸς θεῶν—905 εἰς—909 γ' om.—ἐν' ἄνδρα—911 εἰς.

vv. 912-936 (ms p. 436A):—913 συμφορᾶς—915 τίς—924 γ'—925 φθίας—926 εἰς—929 ὅρε. praef.—τὰ δ'—τίς—932 αἰχμαλώτων—933 λέχος—935 ἂν ἐκαρποῦτο λέχη.

vv. 937-961 (ms p. 436B):—938 μ' ἐχρῆν—939 φυλάττειν—δοσον—941 ἐγὼ γυνήσιους μὲν—943 εἰσάπαξ—944 ἐστὶ—945 εἰσφοιτᾶν—948 αὐτήν—950 πρὸς τὸ δ'—953 δρῶσι—954 εἰς—955 μὲν οὖν—956 γυναικείους—959 τῶνδε—961 φυλὰς H: corr. in φυλακὰς H₂.

vv. 962-986 (ms p. 435A):—966 πέμψω—968 εἰσβαλεῖν—970 πέρσει—971 ἐννόστησε 972 σὸν H: corr. in σὼ H₂—975 ἂν H: corr. in ἀπ' H₁—sup. ἔκτοθεν scr. σ. H₁—ράδιον—977 εἰς τ'—980 συμφοραῖς—983 εἰσπεσοῦσ'—985 χο. om.—γυνω praef.—γὰρ.

vv. 1042-1067 (ms p. 445B):—1042 ἔπεσον—λύπαι—1045 φρυγῶν καὶ—εὐκάρπους γύλας—1046 τὸν om.—ἀ.δα—1054 οἷσπερ οὔσα—1063 μορσύνων—1064 ὅμματ'—1066 δεινδν.

vv. 1068-1091 (ms p. 446A):—1070 ἰὼ μοι μοι—1072 αἰ αἰ—1077 εἰμ'—1079 ut vid. ἀμυνάθην corr. in ἀμυνάθειν—1087 ἐξεπίπλαμεν H: mut. in ἐξεπίμπαμεν H₁—1088 ἀρα—εἰς δέ.

Medea vv. 51-75 (ms p. 508B):—51 ἔστηκας—52 σοῦ—56 εἰς—59 τρο praef.—61 περ ut vid. praef.—63 τρο ut vid. praef.—ἐστὶν—71 ματρὶ.

vv. 76-100 (ms p. 507A):—76 περ praef.—77 δώμασι—78 ἀπωλόμειθ'—ἀρ'—82 ἡμᾶς—84 κακῶς H: o superscr. H₁—γ' om.—εἰς—85 γιγνώσκει H: sup. ei scr. σ H₂—88 τοὺς δέ γ'—οὐνέκ'—89 εἶσω H: ut vid. ε sup. σ scr. H₂—95 μὲν μὴ—98 μῆρ—100 θάττον.

vv. 101-124 (ms p. 427B):—105 νῦν—110 κακοῖς ἢ τῆς μηδείας—111 αἰ αἰ | εἰ εἰ—τλήμων—113 μητρὸς—115 τλήμων—118 πάθητε—121 μεταβάλλουσι—122 ἴσοις—123 εἰ μὴ μεγάλως—124 ὀχυρῶς τ'.

vv. 125-151 (ms p. 428A: v. 125 is visible in the reproduction above p. 422A):—131 φωνὰν—133 ἀλλ' ὦ—135 βοῇ—140 sup. τὸν scr. ὁ H₂ [D.L.P.] (τὸν conj. Musgrave)—141 ἦδ' ut vid.—τάκει—βιοτὰν—143 παραθαλομένη—φρένα om. H: sup. μύθοις add. H₂—148 καὶ φῶς καὶ γὰ—149 ἰαχὰν—151 τί—τὰς—ἀπλάστον.

vv. 152-178 (ms p. 428B: vv. 152-3 are visible in the reproduction above

p. 422B):—152 ἔρ. s.—153 σπεύσει—τελευτὰν sine interpunct.—157 κείνω—punctum post κείνω τότε [D. L. P.]—158 τότε—τάκου ut vid. bis repetitum sed eras.—δδνρομένα—εὐνέταν—160 ὁ μέγαλα θέμι καὶ πότνι' ἄρτεμι—162 ἐνδυσάμενη—163 ὃν πότ'—εἰσίδοιμ'—

165 γεμῆ—172 καταπαύσ.—175 δέξαιτ' corr. in δέξερ' ut vid.—π.σ.—177 καὶ μεθείη λῆμα φρενῶν—178 μὴ μοι.

vv. 179-203 (ms p. 427A):—189 ὀρμ. θῆ—193 sup. τ' εἰλαπίνας scr. τ' εὐθαλαίαις—

194 εὐροντο βίου—196 εὐρετο—199 ἀκείσθαι—201 βοᾶν.

vv. 204-230 (ms p. 507B):—204 ἰαχᾶν—γόνον H: mut. in γόνον H₁—210 εἰς—211 ἄλαι—νύχιον—212 κληῖδ'—215 μέμφουστ'—217 τοὺς δ'—ἀμφ'—218 ἐκτείσαντο H: corr. ut vid. in ἐκτέσαντο H₁—219 ἐνεστ' ἐν—ὀφθαλμοῖσι—224 πολίτης—228 γυνώσκειν—229 ἐκβέβηκόνυδος.

vv. 231-255 (ms p. 508A):—234 κακοῦ γὰρ τοῦτ' ἄλγιον κακὸν (κακοῦ γὰρ τοῦτ' ἔτ' ἄλγιον κακὸν conj. Brunck)—235 κᾶν—λάβει—238 εἰς—240 συνενέτη—243 χρεῶν—245 ἄσσης H: v sup. s scr. H₂—250 ἀσπί. s.—252 αὐτὸς—253 θ' om.—254 in mrg. κ[οινω]ν[ί]α H₂.

vv. 1278-1303 (ms p. 313B):—1280 ὦν—1283 γυναικῶν|ἐν—χείρα—1285 ἐξέπεμπεν 1288 ἱπερτείνουσα ut vid. sed ὅ incerta—1289 συνθανοῦσ'—1290 δὴ ποτ' οὖν—1292

ὄσσα δὴ—ἔρρεσας—1294 δειν'—εἰργασμένα—1295 τοῖσδε γ'—1296 δειν—ῆπον [ῆτοι D. L. P.]—γῆ σφε [D. L. P.]—1297 σῶμα εἰς—βάθον H: superscr. os H₂—1298 εἰ μὴ ut vid. H: v add. H₂—1299 τυράννοῦς—1300 ἀθῶος—1302 μὲν οὖν οὖς (μὲν οὖς οὖς D. L. P.)—ἐρξουσιν—1303 ἐκσῶσαι [fort. D. L. P.].

vv. 1351-1376 (ms p. 313A):—1356 οὐθ' ὁ σοι—1362 μὴ γελᾷς ut vid.—1363 ἡγκύρατ ut vid. [D. L. P.]—1367 οὐνεκα—1369 ἐστὶ.

Hippolytus vv. 320-344 (ms p. 440B):—320 inde ab hoc v. usque ad 337 lineolae praeft.—τίν'—εἶς σ'—321 ἐγωγε κείνον—322 τοῦδ' ὅσ'—323 εἶς σ'—325 ἐξητημένη—326 οὐ—332 οὐκ οὖν—333 δεξιάν τ' ἐμὴν—343 οὐ.

vv. 345-368 (ms p. 439A):—345 ἄμ' ἐχρήν—347 δὴ om.—349 κεχηρημένοι—350 φῆις—τινός;—351 ὅς τις—οὐτος ἐστίν—354 ἀνασχετὰ—361 διώλεσεν—362 ὦ . . . ὦ—

τὰς—364 ὀλύμμαν H: οι sup. v ut vid. scr. H₁—σὰν φιλίαν—365 καταλύσαι—οἶμοι οἶμοι· φεῦ φεῦ—366 ὦ πόνοι τρέφοντες βροτοῦς—ὦ τάλαινα τῶνδ' ἀλγίων—368 ἐξέφηνας—εἰς.

vv. 469-493 (ms p. 439B):—469 καλῶς ἀκριβώσειαν·—εἰς—470 ἐκνεύσαι H: π sup.

v scr. H₂—471 ἔχ. s.—473 φρενῶν κακῶν—480 ἢ τὰρ ἂν H (conj. Brunck): corr. in ἢ τὰρα γ' H₁—484 δυστυχέστερος—λόγων—485 ἀλγίω—488 γὰρ τοι—489 τίς—491 διωστέον.

vv. 494-518 (ms p. 440A):—495 οὐνεχ'—496 προσῆγον—498 συγκλείσεις—499 μεθήσης H: ει sup. η scr. H₁—500 κακῶν ἐστὶ H: κακῶν in καλῶν mut. H₂ et ut vid. add. καὶ ante ἐστὶ—τάδ' om.—503 καὶ μὴν γε H: v del. et punct. superscr. H₁—λέγεις·

—γὰρ om.—504 εὖ—505 δὴ H: corr. in δ' ἦν H₂—λέγεις—506 εἰς—ἂν ἀλωθήσομαι—507 χῆρ' (conj. Nauck)—514 λόγον—515 δνεῖν.

vv. 1136-1160 (ms p. 340B):—1140 νυμφῖδια—ἀπόλωλε λέχη—1141 κόραις—1145 ἀνόνητα—1146 μηνίω—1147 συζυγαίαι—1148 τί—τάλ. v—1150 πέμπεται H: corr. in πέμπετε H₂—1151 ἡμυχ. praeft.—1158 κατ'.

vv. 1161-1186 (ms p. 339A):—1166 ὠλεσεν—1175 κλάοντες—1183 ἐντύνεθ'.

vv. 1290-1313 (ms p. 339B):—1293 τόνδ' ἀνέχεις—1294 ἐν ἀγαθοῖς—1300 . . . ἡς γυναικος οἶστρον—1310 ἦδ'.

vv. 1314-1336 (ms p. 340A):—1317 εἰς παῖδα—1319 χρήν—ῆνεσ.—1322 ἐπέμεινας ut vid.—1323 ἐμεινας—1326 καὶ σοὶ—1327 γίνεσθαι—1336 ἀνάλωσεν.

J. A. SPRANGER.

TH
entrance
made by
another,
In 1933
Entrance
discusse
clusion
the right
the city
used for
parts, an
Professo
(parodus
at their
since th
(Flickin
Greek a

The
Flicking
Ergasilu
490) and
line 497
a cena as
ance upo
forum to
the Rom
Greek c
reference
insertion

If c
assuming
involve
alternati
parasite
entrance.
The
Greek se
of Magn
selves b
Roman
to what

SIDE-ENTRANCES AND ΠΕΠΙΑΚΤΟΙ IN THE HELLENISTIC THEATRE.

THE greatest confusion prevails among modern writers as to the use of the side-entrances in New Comedy and its Latin derivatives. The statements on this subject made by editors and others, whether confident or hesitating, differ widely from one another, and are seldom supported by any real consideration of the ancient evidence. In 1933 Professor Mary Johnston published a careful treatise, entitled *Exits and Entrances in Roman Comedy* (W. F. Humphrey Press, New York), in which she discussed the internal evidence afforded by the Latin plays, and came to the conclusion (page 151) that 'on the stage of the Roman theater the side-entrance to the right of the spectators was used for entrances and exits of characters from and to the city and the forum, and that the side-entrance to the left of the spectators was used for entrances and exits of characters moving from and to the port and foreign parts, and, probably, from and to the country as well.' With regard to Greek usage, Professor Johnston was content to accept the orthodox view 'that the side-entrance (parodus) at the spectators' right led to the harbour or the market-place and that at their left into the country, since the scene was regularly placed in Athens and since these were the actual topographical relationships in the Athenian theater' (Flickinger, page 208). Her conclusion, therefore, involved a discrepancy between Greek and Roman usage as far as the harbour was concerned.

The possibility of such a discrepancy has been admitted by other writers (e.g. Flickinger, page 234); but it raises certain difficulties. At line 461 of the *Captivi* Ergasilus enters on the empty stage. He has come from the forum (cf. lines 478 and 490) and is on his way to the harbour (line 496), in which direction he departs after line 497 (cf. lines 768 ff.). He had no intention of calling on Hegio, whose offer of a *cena aspera* he regards merely as a last resource. The only pretext for his appearance upon the stage must therefore be that he has to cross it in order to get from the forum to the harbour. This is perfectly natural if Professor Johnston is right as to the Roman convention. But how are we to visualize Ergasilus' movements in the Greek original of the play? Had Ergasilus some errand at Hegio's house, all reference to which has been suppressed by Plautus? Or is the whole scene an insertion by Plautus?

If our solution of every difficulty in Plautus is to take the traditional form of assuming that he has tampered with his original in some way, we shall inevitably involve ourselves in a hopeless tangle of subjective argument. Yet either of the alternatives suggested seems preferable to assuming that, in the Greek play, the parasite walked on, delivered his monologue, and then walked off by the same side-entrance.

The Roman dramatists must have taken over their use of the side-entrances from Greek sources; not merely literary sources, but the usage of the Hellenistic theatres of Magna Graecia. Why, then, should they have heaped up difficulties for themselves by modifying Greek convention in one vital point? No one will suggest that Roman topography had anything to do with the matter. Are we really so certain as to what Greek usage was?

The relevant passages in ancient authors appear to be:

(a) Vitruvius, V. vi. § 8:—*ipsae autem scenae suas habeant rationes explicatas ita uti mediae ualuae ornatus habeant aulae regiae; dextra ac sinistra hospitalia; secundum autem spatia ad ornatus comparata, quae loca Graeci περιάκτους dicunt ab eo quod machinae sunt in eis locis uersatiles trigonae, habentes singulae tres species ornationis, quae cum aut fabularum mutationes sunt futurae, seu deorum aduentus cum tonitribus repentinis, uersentur mutantque speciem ornationis in frontes; secundum ea loca uersurae sunt procurentes, quae efficiunt una a foro altera a peregre aditus in scenam.*

(b) Pollux, IV. xix. §§ 125-7:—*παρ' ἐκάτερα δὲ τῶν δύο θυρῶν τῶν περὶ τὴν μέσῃν ἀλλαι δύο ἂν εἶεν, μία ἐκατέρωθεν, πρὸς ἃς αἱ περιάκτοι συμπεπύγασιν, ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ τὰ ἐξω πόλεως δηλοῦσα, ἡ δ' ἀριστερὰ τὰ ἐκ πόλεως, μάλιστα τὰ ἐκ λιμένος, καὶ θεοὺς τε θαλαττίους ἐπάγει, καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα ἐπαχθέστερα ὄντα ἡ μηχανὴ φέρειν ἀδυνατεῖ. εἰ δ' ἐπιστραφεῖεν αἱ περιάκτοι, ἡ δεξιὰ μὲν ἀμείβει τόπον, ἀμφοτέραι δὲ χώραν ὑπαλλάττονσιν. τῶν μέντοι παρόδων ἡ μὲν δεξιὰ ἀγρόθεν ἡ ἐκ λιμένος ἡ ἐκ πόλεως ἄγει· οἱ δὲ ἀλλαχόθεν περὶ ἀφικνούμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἑτέραν εἰσίσιν.*

Pollux further tells us that the keraunoskopeion was a 'high periactus' (§ 130; he couples it with the bronteion, or 'thundermaker'; immediately afterwards he describes the theologeion, on which the gods manifest themselves) and states that the *καταβλήματα* were painted curtains or boards which were 'dropped' (*κατεβάλλετο*) on the periacti, and showed such views as a mountain, a river or the sea, or whatever else might be suitable to the play (§ 131).

There is also a passage in the *Vita Aristophanis* (quoted by Haigh, *A.T.*, page 194, note) to the effect that, if the *chorus* entered 'as from the city', it used the 'left' *ἀψίς*: if from the country, the right.

I can find no reference to any other authoritative texts on the subject of side-entrances, or for that matter on the nature and use of the *periacti*. The passage in the *Vita* deals, of course, with the entry of the chorus into the orchestra by means of the orchestral *παρόδοι*. I am assuming that there was a stage in the Hellenistic as in the Roman theatre, and that it is to this stage that Pollux and Vitruvius are referring; but the author of the *Vita* may fairly be quoted as evidence for the view that on the stage, as in the orchestra, the town and country entrances were opposite to each other. But any fair-minded reader of Haigh's note, referred to above, will agree that the expressions 'right' and 'left' in both Pollux and the *Vita* cannot be understood without further evidence. Such evidence does not exist, so far as the Hellenistic theatre is concerned. The confident statements made by modern writers about the influence of the topography of Athens on the growth of the convention which we are discussing are entirely in the air.

The origins of a dramatic convention should be sought in dramatic, not in topographical conditions. The scene of most New Comedy plays was a street—usually in Athens; characters very frequently come on from the forum or go off towards the forum; the harbour is mentioned rather less frequently; still less frequently is reference made to the country. Professor Johnston calculates (pp. 38 ff.) that, of the twenty-six Latin plays, twenty-four are set in town; of these five require forum, harbour and country; thirteen require forum and harbour only; three require forum and country only; in three plays of Plautus only the forum (town) is actually required (but these three plays are (a) the *Asinaria*, in which 'the entrances are confused, and the movements of the characters cannot be followed satisfactorily'; (b) the *Casina*, in which frequent reference is made to the country, though no one actually goes there; (c) the *Persa*, in which some pretence is made of using the harbour entrance); only two plays, the *Rudens* and the *Heauton*, are set in the country. If we assume that the harbour lies in the same direction as the forum, we leave the opposite entrance unused in some two-thirds of the plays. If, on the

contrary, harbour, all the plays with a country direction, on one side lies on the other for a wall country th

If we of country hear that we are also via the P naturally the open country ne on opposi *Perikeiromen* natural se given by indicated i The *Gorgias* country (A

So far evidence o

Mosch bringing o them, daug Athens. has just re has not ye on his way slaves carr country. his trouble story as the issues a ha of sight as place; Lac received fro there, he w Moschion r arrived. L story of his

In thi Sudhaus); the assumpt Otherwise h father's hou harbour is reference to

contrary, we follow Professor Johnston in opposing the forum to both country and harbour, we shall find that both side-entrances are used, actually or in appearance, in all the plays with a city setting, with the exception of the *Asinaria*. But in the plays with a country setting circumstances may be quite different. It is clear that in the *Rudens* both the town and harbour of Cyrene are thought of as lying in the same direction; on the opposite side is the beach. In the *Heauton* the town as a whole lies on one side; there is no specific mention of the open country, which we may presume lies on the opposite side, but it can well be imagined that when Clitipho is sent off for a walk (line 590) in order to get him out of the way, it is towards the open country that he directs his footsteps.

If we now turn to the remains of Menander's plays we find a higher percentage of country settings. The scene of the *Hero* is a country district near Athens; we hear that a party of hunters will arrive from the town (Fr. Sabb., Capps, page 21); we are also led to expect that Laches will arrive from Lemnos (line 65), presumably via the Piraeus and the town. 'Town' and 'harbour' would, in such circumstances, naturally be thought of as lying in the same direction; on the opposite side would be the open country, the farms of neighbours, etc. The *Epitrepontes* is also set in the country near Athens; we get the general impression that 'town' and 'country' lie on opposite sides; there is no use made of the 'harbour'. The scene of the *Perikeiromene* is a street in Corinth; opposition of market-place and country gives a natural setting; there is no mention of the 'harbour'. The scene of the *Samia* is given by Capps as a street in Athens; the use of the forum entrance is probably indicated in line 69—ἐκ τῆς [ἀγορᾶς]; there is no mention of either harbour or country. The *Gorgias* seems to be set in the town (cf. line 79); Davus comes in from the country (Allinson, line 32).

So far the results of our inquiry are meagre. But in the *Citharistes* we have evidence of a more interesting nature.

Moschion, while on a visit to Ephesus, had seen the procession of freeborn maidens bringing offerings to 'Diana of the Ephesians', and had fallen in love with one of them, daughter of Phantias, a harp-player, who lives next door to his father Laches in Athens. It seems that Moschion has now married this lady; when the plays opens he has just returned to Athens, and is expecting his wife by another ship. This ship has not yet arrived. The opening scene, as given by Allinson, shows Moschion (?) on his way from the harbour to the market-place, talking to a friend, and followed by slaves carrying luggage. He has sent a messenger to summon his father from the country. He is very worried that his bride's ship has not yet arrived, and is pouring his troubles into the sympathetic ear of his friend, and proposes to finish the story as they go together to the market-place. As he passes his father's house he issues a hasty order to his slaves: 'Let someone take these things into the house out of sight as quickly as possible'. Moschion and the friend depart for the market-place; Laches enters from the country. He is mystified at the summons he has received from his son. He is going to look for Moschion indoors; if the lad is not there, he will go on to seek him at the market-place. Laches goes into his house; Moschion returns from the market-place, wondering whether his father has yet arrived. Laches appears: Moschion greets him with warmth, and embarks on the story of his love affair.

In this summary I have followed Allinson's reconstruction closely (cf. also Sudhaus); if he is right, then we have a setting which can only be visualized on the assumption that the harbour entrance was opposite to the market-place entrance. Otherwise how can we account for Moschion's appearance on the stage, in front of his father's house, when hurrying from the harbour to the agora? It is true that the harbour is not mentioned in the extant fragments of the scene; but the young man's reference to his anxiety at his wife's having failed to arrive and his fear lest some

misfortune has befallen her at sea, coupled with his order to the slaves, seems to make it clear that he himself has only just arrived from abroad, and has not yet entered his father's house.

I have failed to find any evidence in the remaining fragments of Menander. I now turn to the statements of Vitruvius and Pollux, quoted above. The concise words of Vitruvius 'una a foro altera a peregre' agree with the view I have expressed, so far as they go; the trouble is that Vitruvius has not given us enough detail. Pollux tells us that the 'right-hand *parodos*' leads 'from the country or the harbour or the city'. This cannot be right; emendation, however, is impossible without assuming the answer to the very question which we are discussing. In each of the passages quoted we find the side-entrances closely connected with the *periacti*. Combining the statements of Vitruvius and Pollux, we find that these devices were revolving three-sided stands, set one at either end of the permanent back-scene, between the side-doors and the side-entrances. Each of the three sides of a *periactus* displayed a different scene. The right-hand *periactus*, according to Pollux, showed 'the region outside the city', the left-hand 'the things from the city, especially the things from the harbour': it also introduced sea-gods, and whatever was too heavy for the *μηχανή*. To revolve the right-hand *periactus* alone indicated a change of *τόπος*, to revolve both *periacti* a change of *χώρα*. Vitruvius on the other hand tells us that the revolution of the *periacti* denoted either a change of play or the arrival of a deity, accompanied by sudden peals of thunder.

None of the descriptions which I have read in modern works (including the 1934 and 1937 P.W.) makes any real attempt to deal with this curious and apparently contradictory evidence; even the sober Haigh (*A.T.*, pages 197-9) is both inadequate and fanciful. All writers seem to agree in regarding the *periacti* as appliances for changing scenery 'the only appliances for changing scenery that are mentioned by the ancient Greek writers' (Haigh). But New Comedy does not appear to have allowed for any change of setting within the course of any one play. There is no evidence for such a change either in Plautus, or in Terence, or in the fragments of Menander. From the beginning to the end of any one play the audience were confronted with the usual three-door back-scene. And what would such a back-scene have to do with the *καταβλήματα* which Pollux says were placed on the *periacti*, showing a mountain, a river or the sea? How artificial, too, would be the 'curious conventional custom' (Haigh) whereby *one* *periactus* was turned to denote a 'slight' change of scene—'merely from one part of the same district to another', whereas 'when the action was transferred to an entirely new district, then both the *periacti* were turned round, and the scenery was changed at each end'. Such an account can only have been penned by a writer who was thinking chiefly in terms of fifth-century drama. We can understand Haigh's conclusion that 'it must have been chiefly in the intervals between successive plays that the *periacti* were employed'; in fact Vitruvius has told us that they *were* so used (*cum fabularum mutationes sunt futurae*). But the *periacti* seem by their nature to have been designed for *rapid* alteration. And what of Vitruvius' other remark that they denoted the arrival of gods, and of Pollux's reference to the introduction of sea-gods 'and objects too heavy for the *mechanē*'? 'It is possible that, of the two sides of the *periaktos* which were out of sight of the audience, one contained a small ledge or balcony, on which the sea-god took his stand. As the machine rolled round, he would come suddenly into view' (Haigh).

Let us look again at Vitruvius and Pollux. We observe:—

(a) that both writers refer to the *periacti* in close connexion with their accounts of the side-entrances;

(b) that both writers speak of 'arrivals'—*deorum aduentus*, *θεοῦς . . . θαλαττίους πάγει*—as in some way connected with the use of the *periacti*; with which evidence

we may
harbour;

(c)
outside th
reminisce
'country'
and

there wer
I think, b
to the auc
any given

Let u
the usual
The signi
prologue,
Moreover,
throughou
use differs
avoid the
periacti, se
opposite or
anxiously e
ence a pict
of *τόπος*.

foreign tow
a revolution
this is a
appropriate
called the
may suppos
turns—or
appears by
may suppos

strepit

(l

and finally :

sed qu

and the god
(ego in caelu
sky; to hera
sea, and the
collectively
infernal deiti
detachable κ

I have
Pollux. On

¹ One, or eve
if not required

we may couple the ἐκ of Pollux—'the things *from* the city', 'the things *from* the harbour';

(c) that Pollux's description of the scenes shown on the periacti—'the region outside the city', 'the things from the city', 'the things from the harbour'—is strongly reminiscent of the use of the side-entrances to denote arrivals from or departures to 'country', 'town' and harbour';

and when we further remember that, while there were only *two* side-entrances, there were *three* conventional significations to be shared between them, we shall, I think, be forced to the conclusion that the function of the periacti was to indicate to the audience the conventional significance to be attached to the side-entrances at any given moment in the play.

Let us suppose that the scene is the usual street in Athens. At the back are the usual three doors, denoting three houses, or two houses and a temple or the like.¹ The significance of these doorways will be made clear to the audience (a) in the prologue, if there is one; (b) by frequent references in the course of the play. Moreover, these doorways in the back-scene will retain their significance unaltered throughout the course of the play. On either hand are the side-entrances. Their use differs from play to play; it may be altered more than once within a play. To avoid the necessity of issuing frequent reminders to the audience, use is made of the periacti, set close to the side-entrances; one may present a view of the market, the opposite one a rural scene (a river, a mountain, etc.). An arrival from abroad is anxiously expected; suddenly one of the periacti swings round, presenting to the audience a picture of the sea, the harbour, a ship, a dolphin or the like. This is a change of τόπος. The play has ended; another, with an entirely fresh setting, perhaps in a foreign town, is to be brought on. It will still require the three doorways; but a revolution of both the periacti will give these doorways the appropriate framework; this is a *mutatio fabulae*, a change of χώρα. A deity is to manifest himself, with appropriate thunder and lightning. Above the stage is set the 'high periactus', also called the 'flash' (περιάκτος ὑψηλῇ, κεραυνοσκοπεῖον); on one, two or all of its sides (we may suppose), a fiery streak is painted on a dark background. The 'high periactus' turns—or perhaps whirls; the βροντεῖον, or 'thunderer', rattles, and the deity appears by the celestial side-entrance, the μηχανή or θεολογεῖον. Such an entry we may suppose was made by Jupiter at the end of the *Amphitruo*:—

streptus, crepitus, sonitus, tonitrus: ut subito, ut prope, ut ualide tonuit!

(line 1062);

ardere censui aedis, ita tum confulgebant (line 1067);

and finally:—

sed quid hoc? quam ualide tonuit! di, obsecro uestram fidem! (1130)

and the god appears in majesty, delivers his decree, and departs whence he came (ego in caelum migro, line 1143): A sea-god, however, cannot well appear from the sky; to herald *his* arrival one of the side periacti will revolve to show a view of the sea, and the god will walk in by the neighbouring side-entrance. Groups of deities, collectively too heavy for the μηχανή, will enter in some such way; ghosts and infernal deities will appear as it were from the depths of Hades; the varieties of the detachable καταβλήματα are unlimited.

I have made no attempt to interpret the terms 'right' and 'left' as used by Pollux. On any view his account is confused, and he is drawing on different and

¹ One, or even two, of the three doorways can, curtains. Only one doorway is needed for the if not required in the play, be concealed by *Amphitruo*.

imperfectly understood authorities. Professor Johnston's independent study of the Latin plays has led her to put the 'forum' entrance to the spectators' right, the 'harbour' and 'country' entrances to the spectators' left. The only qualification I would add is that this arrangement should be limited to plays with a town' setting; a setting in the country may well have necessitated placing the harbour in the same direction as the town, as is, in fact, the case in the *Rudens*, and perhaps in the *Hero*; our arrangement of the *Rudens* will depend on our interpretation of *ad dexteram* in line 156 and again in line 254. What I am most concerned with is to show that, so far from there being any discrepancy between Greek and Roman practice, there is every reason to suppose that the Romans adopted unchanged the use of the side-entrances which they found prevailing in the theatres of Magna Graecia.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL.

W. BEARE.

IN C. G.
which were
product of
is still poss
Dobree an
have been

I 120,
[ἐχόμενα] τ

As τελ
with ἀσθεν
Contrast τ
'completely
this sense
οὐ τελέη

Inciden
absorbed b
be requisite

132, 2

Either
suspected a
θύοντι, a gl

186, 1

I can c
as Schweig
'thereafter
that which
ταῦτα refers
with. For

191, 2

Κατὰ τ
surprising,
generated κ
permutantur

193, 3

ἐπὶ τριηκόσι

From t
a sense un
Θασίουι προ

199, 1

In 4, 6

¹ ὡς Περσέ
ταῦτα γράψω 1.
² Dem. in C

NOTES ON HERODOTUS—III.

In C.Q. 1935, 72-82 and 150-163 I published some observations on Herodotus which were the by-product of a translation. Those which follow are the similar by-product of a lexicon. It says much for the delusive simplicity of Herodotus that it is still possible to reap a critical crop from an author who has been read by Reiske, Dobree and Cobet. Had van Herwerden not edited Herodotus, the harvest would have been twice as large.

I 120, 3 *παρὰ σμικρὰ γὰρ καὶ τῶν λογίων ἡμῖν ἔνια κεχώρηκε, καὶ τὰ γε τῶν ὀνειράτων [ἐχόμενα] τελέως ἐς ἀσθενὲς ἔρχεται.*

As *τελέως* cannot here mean 'at the last', the only possibility is to construe it with *ἀσθενὲς*. But *τελέως ἀσθενὲς* 'quite slight' is bad English, not good Greek. Contrast *τελέως ἄφρων* Isaeus 12, 4; one can be 'completely' mad, but not 'completely' small. Read therefore <δ>*τελέως*, 'in imperfect fulfilment'. In this sense Astyages in the next chapter says to Cyrus (121): *σὲ ἐγὼ δι' ὅψιν ὀνειρόν οὐ τελέην ἠδίδικον.*

Incidentally, *ἐχόμενα* is a gloss on the genitive *τῶν ὀνειράτων*, which had been absorbed before *ἀ*-fell out. Otherwise *τὰ ὀνειράτων ἐχόμενα* without the article would be requisite; see I, 193, 4; 2, 77, 5; 3, 25, 4; 66, 1; 5, 49, 8; 8, 142, 4.

132, 2 *ἑωντῷ μὲν δὴ [τῷ θύοντι] ἰδίῳ μόνῳ οὐ οἱ ἐγγίνεται ἀρᾶσθαι ἀγαθὰ.*

Either *τῷ θύοντι* or *οἱ* must go, and the guilty party is not *οἱ*, which Legrand suspected as a dittography of *οὐ*, but which is protected by POxy. 2096. It is *τῷ θύοντι*, a gloss on *οἱ*, that should be expelled.

186, 1 *ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ἐκ βάθεος περιβάλετο, τοιγύνη δὲ [ἐξ] αὐτῶν παρενθήκην ἐποιήσατο.*

I can offer no explanation of the baffling *ἐκ βάθεος*, but I wish to see *ἐξ* deleted, as Schweighäuser once proposed (*Lex. Herod.* II 184a). 'Εξ αὐτῶν cannot mean 'thereafter'; for a parenthesis (*παρανθήκη*) comes in the middle, not at the end, of that which it interrupts. Nor on the other hand can it signify the material; for *ταῦτα* refers to embankments and a lake, and this is no stuff to make a *παρανθήκη* with. For *παρανθήκη* αὐτῶν cf. π. τοῦ λόγου 7, 5, 3; 171, 1.

191, 2 *οὕτω τε δὴ τάξας καὶ [κατὰ] ταῦτα παραινέσας ἀπήλανε.*

Κατὰ ταῦτα thus occurs nowhere else in Herodotus,¹ and if it did, would still be surprising, as its meaning is no different from that of *οὕτω*. *Καὶ* and *τα*- have generated *κατά*, as very often happens; see Madvig *Adv.* I 546: *καὶ et κατά facillime permutantur maximeque sequente voce, quae a τ incipiat, oritur κατά*, and examples there.

193, 3 *ἐπὶ διηκόσια μὲν τὸ παράπαν ἀποδοῖ, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἄριστα αὐτῇ ἐωντῆς ἐνείκει, ἐπὶ τριηκόσια ἐκφέρει.*

From the antithesis it is clear that *τὸ παράπαν* should mean 'generally, usually', a sense unexampled anywhere.² We require *ἐπίπαν*, as 6, 46, 3: *ὥστε τὸ ἐπίπαν θασίους προσήκει ἔτεος ἐκάστου διηκόσια τάλαντα, ὅτε δὲ τὸ πλείστον προσῆλθε, τριηκόσια.*

199, 1 [*ἐπὶ ζευγέων*] *ἐν καμάρῃσι ἐλάσασαι πρὸς τὸ ἱρὸν ἐστῶσι.*

In 4, 69, 1 the word *καμάρη* has been displaced by its gloss *ἄμαξα*: *ἐπεὶ ἄμαξαν*

¹ ὡς Περσέων μετεξέτεροι λέγουσι . . . , κατὰ ταῦτα γράψω I, 95, 1 is different.

by L. and S., is not similar: οὐδὲ πεντήκοντα δραχμῶν τὸ παράπαν ἅπαντ' ἀπολωλέκασιν.

² Dem. in Calliclem § 28 (= 1279. 22), compared

καμάρης (dP: om. a) φρυγάνων πλήσσωσι (see *Ph.W.* 1934, 1068-1071). Here gloss and text stand side by side. Cf. Pollux 10, 52: τὰ μὲν τῶν ὀχημάτων σκευοφόρα ἄν εἴη, . . . τὰ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἐγκατακλίνειν ἐνευναία, τὰ δὲ κατὰστεγα καὶ στεγαστὰ καμάραι· οὕτω γὰρ Ἡρόδοτος ὠνόμασεν.

207, 1 εἶπον καὶ πρότερον, . . . τὸ ἄν ὁρῶ σφάλμα ἐδὲν οἴκῳ τῷ σῶ, κατὰ δύναμιν ἀποτρέψειν.

Only a σφάλμα can be a σφάλμα, and then it is past averting. Compare 7, 6, 4, εἰ μὲν τι ἐνέοι σφάλμα φέρον τῷ βαρβάρῳ, τῶν μὲν ἔλεγε οὐδέν and 9, 2 πρὶν τι ἄλλο Ἀθηναίοισι δόξαι σφάλμα φέρον τῇ Ἑλλάδι, and read φέρον.

II 19, 2 κατέρχεται μὲν ὁ Νεῖλος πληθύνων ἀπὸ τροπέων τῶν θερινῶν ἀρξάμενος ἐπὶ ἑκατὸν ἡμέρας, πελάσας δὲ ἐς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τουτέων τῶν ἡμερῶν ὀπίσω ἀπέρχεται ἀπολείπων τὸ ρέεθρον.

As the text stands, ἀπολείπων must be taken absolutely, 'departing, leaving (the flooded land)', and τὸ ρέεθρον as accusative of respect with ἀπέρχεται, 'as regards its stream'; thus ἀπολείπων is harsh and τὸ ρέεθρον futile. Read ἐπιλείπων τὸ ρέεθρον, 'declining, failing, in volume', and compare 7, 43, 1 ὁ Σκάμανδρος ἐπέλιπε τὸ ρέεθρον; 58, 3 ποταμὸς οὐκ ἀντισχῶν τὸ ρέεθρον ἀλλ' ἐπιλιπών. The corruption was caused by assimilation to ἀπέρχεται.

27 τῆς αὔρης δὲ πέρι, ὅτι οὐκ ἀποπνέει, τήνδε ἔχω γνώμην.

This sentence refers to 19, 3: ταῦτά τε δὴ βουλόμενος εἰδέναι ἱστόρεον καὶ ὁ τι αὔρας ἀποπνεύσας μῦθος πάντων ποταμῶν οὐ παρέχεται. As all editors read ὁ τι here, they should do so also in 27.

42, 3-4 τέλος δέ, ἐπεὶτε λιπαρέειν τὸν Ἡρακλέα, τὸν Δία μηχανήσασθαι <τάδε> κριὸν ἐκδεύραντα προσχέσθαι τε τὴν κεφαλὴν, κτλ.

Neater than Herold's τάδε or Fritsch's τοιόνδε would be μηχανήσασθαι κριόν, ἐκδεύραντα <δέ>. Cf. I, 123, 4 λαγὼν μηχανησάμενος καὶ ἀνασχίνας τούτου τὴν γαστέρα.

Ibid., 4-5 ἀπὸ τούτου κριοπρόσωπον τοῦ Διὸς τῷγαλμα ποιέουσι Αἰγύπτιοι, ἀπὸ δὲ Αἰγυπτίων Ἀμμωνιοί, ἰόντες Αἰγυπτίων . . . ἀποικοί. δοκέειν δέ μοι, καὶ τὸ οὐνομα Ἀμμώνιοι ἀπὸ τούδε σφί<σι> τὴν ἐπωνυμίην ἐποιήσαντο. Ἀμοῦν γὰρ Αἰγύπτιοι καλέουσι τὸν Δία.

Read τῆς ἐπωνυμίας.

43, 2 τοῦ Ἡρακλέος τούτου οἱ γονεές ἀμφότεροι ἦσαν [Ἀμφιτρύων καὶ Ἀλκμήνη] γεγονότες τὸ ἀνέκαθεν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου.

52, 1 θεοὺς προσωνόμασάν σφας ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου, ὅτι κόσμῳ θέντες τὰ πάντα πρήγματα καὶ πάσας νομάς εἶχον.

The sense of κόσμῳ θέντες τὰ πάντα πρήγματα is complete in itself; the addition καὶ πάσας νομάς causes only difficulty, because (1) πρήγματα and νομάς are not co-ordinate, the former being concrete, the latter abstract; (2) the verb κόσμῳ θείναι is inappropriate to νομάς—'distributions' or 'provinces' are not 'set in order'; and (3) if τὰ πάντα πρήγματα and πάσας νομάς were co-ordinate, we should expect τὰς πάσας νομάς. I conclude that some participle such as νείμαντες has fallen out after νομάς.

79, 3 ἔφασαν . . . ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸν ἄωρον θρήνοισι τούτοις ὑπὸ Αἰγυπτίων τιμηθῆναι [καὶ] δοῖσθαι τε ταύτην πρώτην καὶ μούνην σφίσι γενέσθαι.

Kaί is often absorbed or generated by -ναι.¹

¹ Abicht transposed τε after πρώτην.

116, 1-2 μετῆκε ("Ομηρος) αὐτὸν (τὸν λόγον), δηλώσας ὡς καὶ τοῦτον ἐπίσταιτο τὸν λόγον. δῆλον δέ· κατὰ γὰρ ἐποίησε ἐν 'Ιλιάδι . . . πλάνην τὴν 'Αλεξάνδρου.

Neither Reiz's κατὰπερ nor Schaefer's κατὰ τὰ nor Bekker's κατὰ παρεποίησε is possible, because δῆλον κατὰ (or κατὰπερ) cannot stand for δῆλον ἐξ ὧν or the like. Nor does Madvig's κατ' αὐτὰρ with anacoluthon resumed by ἐν τούτοις τοῖσι ἔπεισι § 6 justify the text; for αὐτὰρ ἐποίησε πλάνην is not Greek for 'what he wrote about the wandering'. I suggest κατὰ <ταῦτα> γάρ: 'for it was following this version that he mentioned the wandering'.

122, 3 οἱ ἱρέες κατ' ὧν ἔδισαν ἐνδὸς αὐτῶν μίτρῃ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, ἀγαγόντες δέ μιν . . . ἐς ὁδὸν φέρουσαν ἐς Δῆμητρος αὐτοὶ ἀπαλλάσσονται ὀπίσω, τὸν δὲ ἱρέα τοῦτον <τὸν> καταδεδεμένον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς λέγουσι ὑπὸ δύο λύκων ἀγεσθαι ἐς τὸ ἱρόν.

124, 3 χρόνον δὲ ἐγγενέσθαι τριβομένῃ τῷ λεῖψι δέκα εἴτε α μὲν τῆς ὁδοῦ κατ' ἣν εἴλκον τοὺς λίθους.

The position of μὲν shows that δέκα εἴτεα should be written δεκαέτεα as an adjective agreeing with χρόνον. Cf. τριέτεα καὶ τετραέτεα χρόνον I, 199, 5. Earlier editors gave δέκα μὲν εἴτεα, which isolates χρόνον. Similarly Schweighäuser's τριηκονταέτεα τριήκοντα εἴτεα 7, 148, 4 should be received.

127, 3 ὑποδείμας τὸν πρῶτον δόμον λίθον Αἰθιοπικοῦ ποικίλου, τεσσαράκοντα πόδας ὑποβάς τῆς ἐτέρης <τὸ μὴ> τῶντὸ μέγαθος <ἔχειν> ἐχομένην τῆς μεγάλης οἰκοδόμησε.

Some change is necessary. I prefer this to Wiedemann's [τῶν]τό. Compare 2, 7, 2 συμκρόν τι τὸ διάφορον εὔροι τις ἂν τῶν ὁδῶν τουτέων, τὸ μὴ ἴσας μῆκος εἶναι.

139, 1 τέλος δὲ τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς τοῦ Αἰθίοπος ὦδε ἔλεγον γενέσθαι.

I do not deny that τέλος τῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς conceivably might mean 'the final departure'. But the position of τέλος and the striking parallel 9, 9, 1: τέλος δὲ τῆς τε ὑποκρίσιος καὶ ἐξόδου τῶν Σπαρτιητέων ἐγένετο τρόπος τοιούσδε suggest to me that the original may have been something like [ὦδε] ἔλεγον <τοιόνδε τρόπον> γενέσθαι. Blakesley also thought the sentence corrupt, and Larcher wished to read τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν.

III 34, 4 πρότερον γὰρ δὴ ἄρα Περσέων οἱ συνέδρων ἐόντων καὶ Κροίσου εἶρετο ὁ Καμβύσης κοῖος τις δοκεῖ ἀνὴρ εἶναι.

Περσέων οἱ συνέδρων ἐόντων can mean neither 'the Persians who were his councillors' nor 'some Persians who were in council with him'. It can only mean 'the Persians, when they were in council with him', which is absurd. Τῶν should therefore be added after Περσέων.

36, 2 πατὴρ σὸς Κῦρος.

In Herodotus we find πατὴρ σός again 7, 107, 1 and 104, 2, as well as παῖς σός I, 42, 2 and 209, 3. Here and in the other cases of πατὴρ σός Bekker, followed by Hude and others, writes πατὴρ <ὁ> σός. But as the article is omitted with σός in these combinations and in these alone, it is clear that with close degrees of relationship it could grammatically be dispensed with. Compare *mio padre*, not *il mio padre*, in Italian.

44, 2 Καμβύσης . . . ἔπεμπε ἐς Σάμον δεησόμενος Πολυκράτεος στρατὸν ἅμα πέμψαι ἑωυτῷ.

δεόμενος a: δεησομένους van Herwerden.

With πέμπω the following constructions are found in Herodotus: (a) ἔπεμπον λίσιν τινὰ αἰτησόμενοι 6, 139, 1, cf. ἀπέπεμψε μαντευσόμενος I, 46, 3; (b) ἔπεμψαν ἡμέας λέγοντες 9, 7a, 1; (c) πέμπουσι ἀγγέλους διζημένους 4, 151, 2; so

perhaps 7, 15, 1 (καλέοντα); (d) ἐπεπόμφεε χρησομένους 1, 85, 1; so 4, 161, 1; 6, 85, 1; 135, 2; 7, 148, 2; 8, 98, 1; 138, 1; 142, 1; 9, 6; 12, 2; 54, 2; and (e) ἐπεμψε τοὺς αἰτήσοντας 7, 133, 2. Thus it appears that either of the MS readings might stand.

48, 1 ὑβρισμα γὰρ καὶ [ἐς] τούτους εἶχε ἐκ τῶν Σαμίων γενόμενον γενεῇ πρότερον.

Compare 1, 69, 3 καὶ γὰρ τινες αὐτοὺς εὐεργεσίαι εἶχον ἐκ Κροίσου πρότερον ἐτι γεγόνυαι. The text is untranslatable. No parallel has been produced for εἶχε γενόμενον = ἐγεγόνεε; for in 7, 143, 1 ἐς Ἀθηναίους εἶχε τὸ ἔπος εἰρημένον, ἔχειν ἐς means 'refer to'.

52, 3 κότερα τούτων αἰρετώτερά ἐστι, ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ἔχων πρήσσεις ἢ τὴν τυραννίδα καὶ ἀγαθὰ τὰ νῦν ἐγὼ ἔχω, ταῦτα . . . παραλαμβάνειν;

Ταῦτα πράσσω means 'I do this', never 'I fare thus', which is οὕτω πράσσω; and all the examples of πράσσω with neuter objects cited by lexica as intransitive will be found to be transitive and to mean 'do'.¹ Therefore ταῦτα τὰ νῦν ἔχων πρήσσεις means 'this that you now keep on doing', whereas the context shows that ἔχων ought to mean 'having'. In some way πρήσσεις is corrupt. Rather than suppose it to conceal πτωχεύεις or the like, I should prefer to insert an adverb such as οὕτω or κακῶς.

60, 4 νῆδος τοῦ ἀρχιτέκτων πρῶτος ἐγένετο Ῥοῖκος Φιλέω.

There is much confusion over the name of Rhoecus's sire. The editors have always accented Φίλεω, of which the nominative would be Φίλεως; but Thiersch proposed Φιλέω, which implies a nominative Φιλέης. The name is mentioned elsewhere only by Pausanias in the genitive as Φιλαίων (8, 14, 5; 10, 38, 3); for Suidas s.νν. Φιλέας and Φίλεως says nothing to indicate that either name is connected with Rhoecus. Supposing that the name was known only in the genitive, a nominative Φιλέας, Ionic Φιλέης, would bring Herodotus and Pausanias into line, supposing itacism in the latter.

68, 5 οὐτε Ἀτόσση δύναμαι ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν οὐτε ἄλλην οὐδεμίαν ιδέσθαι τῶν συγκατημένων γυναικῶν.

No editor comments on this passage, but it has always been misunderstood by translators, who refer τῶν συγκατημένων γυναικῶν to the mage's other wives, doing violence to the meaning of συγκατῆσθαι. It means 'the women who sit with her (Atossa)', that is, her handmaidens, ἄλλην being exclusive. Phaedima tells her father that she is allowed to communicate with Atossa neither directly nor indirectly.

74, 2 ὑπισχνέμενοι τὰ πάντα οἱ μύρια δύοσειν.

The hyperbolic expression formed on the analogy of πάντα δέκα δίδοναι, etc. (4, 88, 1; 9, 81, 2) requires μύρια, an exact number; the μυρία of the editors (except Abicht²) would be pointless.

78, 1 οἱ δὲ μάγοι ἔτυχον ἀμφοτέροι τῆνικαῦτα ἔοντες τε ἔσω καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ Πρηξάσπεος γενόμενα ἐν βουλή ἔχοντες. ἐπεὶ ὦν εἶδον τοὺς εὐνούχους τεθοριβημένους τε καὶ βοῶντας, ἀνά τε ἔδραμον πάλιν ἀμφοτέροι καὶ ὡς ἔμαθον τὸ ποιούμενον, πρὸς ἀλκὴν ἐτράποντο.

All editors who notice the phrase ἀνά τε ἔδραμον πάλιν render: 'rushed back (into the room which they had left to enquire the cause of the disturbance)'. Not only is a stage of the action thus omitted by Herodotus but ὡς ἔμαθον τὸ ποιούμενον comes in

¹ Conversely πράσσω with an adverb is always intransitive. In 9, 109, 3 φοβεύμενος Ἀμυστριν, μὴ . . . οὕτω ἐπευρεθῇ πρήσσω, the meaning is 'should thus be caught in the act', not 'should

be found doing thus'.

² Blakesley also saw the meaning but failed to change the accent.

the wrong place; for enlightenment must have preceded the running back as well as the resort to arms. Moreover, ἀνέδραμον is used by Herodotus of persons four times elsewhere, but never thus. It always means 'jump to one's feet', and that is the meaning here. The magi sat down to debate the action of Prexaspes, then seeing (and hearing) the commotion they 'leapt up again', and on learning the cause took to arms. If there is any inexactitude, it is in the use of εἶδον for ᾗσθοντο or the like.

89, 2 τοῖσι μὲν αὐτῶν ἀργύριον ἀπαγινέουσι εἴρητο Βαβυλώνιον σταθμὸν τάλαντον ἀπαγινέειν, τοῖσι δὲ χρυσίον ἀπαγινέουσι Εὐβοϊκόν.

From editions and translations it appears usual to take Βαβυλώνιον σταθμόν together, either as an (ungrammatical and meaningless) accusative of respect, or in apposition to τάλαντον, without explaining what ἀπαγινέειν Βαβυλώνιον σταθμόν could mean. Βαβυλώνιον τάλαντον belongs together and is qualified by the accusative of respect σταθμόν; so 2, 96, 4 and several times in 1, 50 and 51. Thus the next sentence begins τὸ δὲ Βαβυλώνιον τάλαντον δύναται κτλ. The singular τάλαντον is collective.

IV 8, 3 τὰς δὲ οἱ ἵππους [τὰς] ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρματος νεμομένας ἐν τούτῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἀφανισθῆναι. τὰς delevit Krüger; ἀπό d.

Τὰς ἀπό is the truth, not [τὰς] ὑπό; for Herodotus never has ὑπό with the genitive meaning 'from under'.

42, 2 ἐντειλάμενος δι' Ἡρακλέων στηλέων διεκπλέειν [ἕως] ἐς τὴν βορρῆν θάλασσαν καὶ οὕτως ἐς Αἴγυπτον ἀπικνέεσθαι.

'To sail through the Straits of Gibraltar until they reached the Mediterranean' is not only nonsense; it is also a mistranslation. ἕως ἀπικνέεσθαι does not mean 'until they came'; that could only be ἕως ἀπικέσθαι. ἕως has been generated by ἐς, as often; in Thuc. 3, 108, 3 ἐς ὅψι has been corrupted to ἕως ὅψι by some MSS, to ἕως ἐς ὅψι by others.

85, 3 τοῦτον τοῦ πελάγεος τὸ στόμα ἐστὶ εὖρος τέσσερες στάδιοι, μῆκος δὲ τοῦ στόματος, ὁ αὐχὴν, τὸ δὲ Βόσπορος κέκληται, . . . ἐπὶ σταδίου εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐστί.

Blakesley's deletion of τοῦ στόματος would require ὅς instead of τό, and Macan's of ὁ αὐχὴν does not relieve the impossible construction μῆκος . . . ἐπὶ σταδίου εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐστί. All that is necessary is to remove the comma after στόματος, taking μῆκος (like εὖρος preceding) as accusative of respect. For τοῦ στόματος ὁ αὐχὴν cf. 118, 1 ὁ αὐχὴν τοῦ Βοσπόρου.

99, 1-2 κόλπου δὲ ἀγομένου τῆς γῆς ταύτης, ἡ Σκυθική τε ἐκδέκεται καὶ ὁ Ἰστρος ἐκδιδοῖ ἐς αὐτήν. . . τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ Ἰστρον ἔρχομαι σημανέων τὸ πρὸς θάλασσαν αὐτῆς [τῆς Σκυθικῆς χώρας], <ὅσον ἐστί> ἐς μέτρησιν. ἀπὸ Ἰστρον αὕτη ἦδη ἀρχαίη Σκυθίη ἐστί (? εὐθὺς ἦδη ἀρχαίη <ετ>αι ἡ Σκυθίη [ἐστί]).

Compare 4, 36, 2 δηλώσω μέγαθός τε ἐκάστης αὐτέων καὶ οἷα τίς ἐστί ἐς γραφὴν ἐκάστη. Εὐθὺς is frequently confounded with parts of αὐτός; e.g. Thuc. 8, 5, 3 εὐθὺς Β: αὐτός cett. No one has yet succeeded in explaining what ἀρχαίη Σκυθίη means.

119, 4 ἣν μέντοι ἐπὶ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἄρξην τε ἀδικέων καὶ ἡμεῖς οὐ πεισόμεθα.

'Ημέας would be a big improvement. Bekker's περιοφόμεθα is still the best remedy for the impossible πεισόμεθα.

133, 1 ἡ Σκυθίων μία μοῖρα ἡ ταχθεῖσα πρότερον μὲν παρὰ τὴν Μαιῆτιν λίμνην φρουρεῖν, τότε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰστρον Ἰωσι ἐς λόγους ἐλθεῖν.

The tactics of the Scythians were not to 'patrol', but to flee before Darius and

draw him on; 4, 120, 2 πρὸς τὴν μίαν τῶν μοιρέων . . . προσχωρεῖν Σαυρομάτας. τούτους μὲν δὴ ὑπάγειν . . . ἰθὺ Τανάϊδος ποταμοῦ παρὰ τὴν Μαίητιν λίμνην ὑποφύγοντας. Φρουρεῖν should therefore be changed to φεύγειν or φυγεῖν, which in the MSS would be written φυγέειν.

I take this opportunity of restoring a passage of Thucydides. In 8, 74, 2 the Four Hundred set the Parali to patrol Euboea: μετεμβιβάσαντες ἐς ἄλλην στρατιῶτιν ναῦν ἔταξαν φρουρεῖν περὶ Εὐβοίαν. In 86, 9 the Parali are described as οἱ τότε ἐτάχθησαν ἐν τῇ στρατιῳτίδι νηὶ ὑπὸ τῶν τετρακοσίων περιπελεῖν Εὐβοίαν. Read περιπολεῖν, and compare 6, 45, where περιπόλια has been corrupted in the archetype to περίπλοια.

163, 3 ἦν δὲ τὴν κάμινον εὐρῆς πλέην ἀμφορέων, μὴ ἐξοπτήσης τοὺς ἀμφορέας ἀλλ' ἀπόπεμπε κατ' οὖρον· εἰ δὲ ἐξοπτήσεις [τὴν κάμινον], μὴ ἐσέλθης ἐς τὴν ἀμφίρρυτον.

One does not 'bake' an oven. A glossator wanted an object to ἐξοπτήσεις and supplied the wrong one.

173 Νασαμῶσι δὲ προσόμουροί εἰσι Ψύλλοι.

πρός

This queer ἀπαξ εἰρημένον may well be a product of ὁμουροι. Herodotus has both words frequently.

V 7 θεοὺς δὲ σέβονται μόνους τούσδε, Ἄρεα καὶ Διόνυσον καὶ Ἀρτεμιν· οἱ δὲ βασιλείες αὐτῶν, πᾶρεξ τῶν ἁλλων πολιέων, σέβονται Ἑρμῆν μάλιστα θεῶν.

Πάρεξ means 'except' and 'besides'; it does not mean 'unlike, apart from', as it ought to do here. Read therefore πάρεξ τῶν ἄλλοι πολιῆται.

19, 1 εἶκε τῇ ἡλικίᾳ ἀπιὼν τε ἀναπαύεο μὴδὲ λιπάρεε τῇ πόσι.

The unexampled dative¹ is so difficult that it is tempting to enrich the language with a new compound and write μὴδ' ἐλλιπάρεε.

75, 1 μελλόντων δὲ συνάψειν [τὰ στρατόπεδα] ἐς μάχην Κορίνθιοι . . . ἀπαλλάσσονται.

Compare 6, 108, 5 μελλόντων δὲ συνάπτειν μάχην Κορίνθιοι οὐ περιεῖδον. As συνάπτειν can be said absolutely (4, 80, 2), there is no impropriety in συνάπτειν ἐς μάχην side by side with συνάπτειν μάχην; but συνάπτειν τὰ στρατόπεδα ἐς μάχην is unparalleled and due to someone who missed an object for συνάψειν.

78 ἐλευθερωθέντων δὲ αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἑνωτῷ προεθυμέτό <τι> κατεργάζεσθαι.

Κατεργάζεσθαι needs an object.

92ε, 2 πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε πολλῶ δέ τι πλείστους τῆς ψυχῆς.

It is a remarkable coincidence that the curious expressions πολλῶ τι (3, 116, 1; 33, 1; 6, 78, 2) and ὀλίγῳ τι (4, 79, 2; 81, 2; 6, 69, 2; 8, 95) with comparatives and superlatives are invariably before π-, which so easily generates and absorbs τι.

117 εἶλε μὲν Δάρδανον, εἶλε δὲ Ἀβυδὸν τε καὶ Περκώτην καὶ Λάμψακον καὶ Παισόν· ταύτας μὲν ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἐκάστη αἶρεε.

Ἐκάστην Madvig. I think I can do better: ταύτας μίαν ἐπ' ἡμέρῃ ἐκάστη.

VI 75, 3 ἀπέθανε . . . ὥς Ἀργεῖοι (λέγουσι), ὅτι ἐξ ἱροῦ αὐτῶν τοῦ Ἀργον [Ἀργείων] τοὺς καταφυγόντας ἐκ τῆς μάχης καταγινέων κατέκοπτε.

Ἀργείων is a gloss on αὐτῶν, which is partitive with τοὺς καταφυγόντας. Of καταγινέων Stein says 'Der Hain lag auf einem Hügel, daher κατ-'; others explain 'bringing home', because Cleomenes tempted his victims into the open by saying that he had received their ransoms. Read ἐξαγινέων, corrupted by assimilation to κατέκοπτε following.

¹ Τὸν λιπαρόντα τῇ ἐταίρᾳ Diog. L. 6, 66; but emends τὴν ἐταίραν. the meaning there is 'importune', and Richards

103
ἱπποὶ ἦδ'

Exc
πλέω ca
accusati
ἀνείλοντο
ruption
slightly

125
So
corrupt.
the sens

140
χερσόνη

Her
εἶναι δυ
accusati
On the
3, 99, 1
... Αἰγ

VII
δὲ Γέργι
A re

55
παντοίων

The
Then ne
ἐπὶ δὲ το
the entir
Compar
στρατὸς
ὁμιλος ἦ

67,
ἦρχε Φερ
The
Μηδικόισ

126
Thi
The req
beasts'.
τε τείχη

127
Τοῦ

153
Wit
everybo

103, 4 . . . αἱ ἵπποι αὐταὶ αἱ τρεῖς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀνελόμεναι ἐποίησαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι ἵπποι ἤδη τὸντο τοῦτο Εὐαγόρεω Λάκωνος, πλέω δὲ τουτέων οὐδαμαί.

Except that Abicht silently reads *τούτων*, the editors make no comment. But *πλέω* can be neither nominative feminine—that would be *πλέους* or *πλείωνες*—nor accusative neuter. *Τὸντο τοῦτο ἐποίησαν* can stand vicariously for *τρεῖς Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀνείλοντο*, but not *πλέω ἐποίησαν* for *πλείνας Ὀλυμπιάδας ἀνείλοντο*. *Πλέω* is a corruption of *πλέους* (see L. Dindorf in *Thesaurus* VI 1429), and *πλέους οὐδαμαί* is a slightly illogical equivalent of *οὐ πλέους*, as *πλέον οὐδεν* (6, 52, 6, etc.) of *οὐ πλέον*.

125, 3 ἐνδὺς κιθῶνα μέγαν καὶ κόλπον βαθὺν † καταλιπόμενος † τοῦ κιθῶνος.

So far from emending *καταλιπόμενος*, the editors have not even noticed that it is corrupt. But *καταλείπεσθαι* means 'leave behind one'. Some word is required with the sense of *κατέμενος*.

140, 2 Ἡφαιστίες μὲν νυν ἐπίθοντο, Μυριναῖοι δὲ οὐ συγγινώσκομενοι [εἶναι τὴν χερσόνησον Ἀττικὴν] ἐπολιορκέοντο.

Herodotus has the infinitive after *συγγινώσκομαι*, as *συνεγινώσκετο ἑωυτῷ οὐκέτι εἶναι δυνατός* 3, 53, 1 and 1, 45, 3; 4, 126; 5, 86, 2; 6, 61, 2, but nowhere else the accusative and infinitive, which he uses with *συγγινώσκω* 1, 89, 3; 91, 6; 4, 43, 6. On the other hand, *οὐ συγγινώσκεσθαι* absolutely for 'resist, stand out' is regular: 3, 99, 1; 5, 94, 2; cf. especially 6, 92, 2 Σικυνῶνιοι συγγιγνόντες ἀδικῆσαι ὠμολόγησαν . . . Αἰγινῆται δὲ οὐτε συνεγινώσκοντο ἡσάν τε αὐθαδέστεροι.

VII 43, 2 ἐν ἀριστερῇ μὲν ἀπέργων Ῥοίτειον πόλιν καὶ Ὀφρύνειον καὶ Δάρδανον, ἐν δεξιῇ δὲ Γέργιθας [Τευκρούς].

A reader remembered 5, 122, 2 εἴλε Γέργιθας τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τῶν ἀρχαίων Τευκρῶν.

55, 2 ἡγέοντο πρῶτα μὲν οἱ μύριοι Πέρσαι . . . , μετὰ δὲ τούτους [ὁ] σύμμικτος στρατὸς παντοῖων ἐθνῶν. ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην οὗτοι, τῇ δὲ ὑστεραίῃ . . .

The vanguard (*ἡγέοντο*) comprised (1) the Immortals; (2) miscellaneous troops. Then next day came Xerxes' forerunners, Xerxes himself and Xerxes' rearguards; ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις ὁ ἄλλος στρατός. But ὁ σύμμικτος στρατός with the article would include the entire army, and none would be left to bring up the rear as ὁ ἄλλος στρατός. Compare 40, 1 ἡγέοντο δὲ πρῶτοι μὲν οἱ σκευοφόροι τε καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια, μετὰ δὲ τούτους στρατὸς παντοίων ἐθνῶν ἀναμίξ, and then, bringing up the rear, 41, 2 ἔπειτα ὁ λοιπὸς ὁμιλος ἡμε ἀναμίξ. O would be absorbed or generated easily by -C C-.

67, 1 πέδιλα δὲ ἐς γόνυ ἀνατείνοντα εἶχον, τόξα δὲ καὶ αἰχμὰς Μηδικά[s]. Σαραγγέων δὲ ἦρχε Φερενδάτης.

The bows as well as the spears were Median; cf. 66, 1 τόξοις ἐσκευασμένοι ἦσαν Μηδικοῖσι. The σ is a dittography of that following.

126 βόες ἄγριοι τῶν τὰ κέρα ὑπερμεγάρθῃ ἐστι τὰ ἐς Ἑλλήνας φοιτέοντα.

This would mean 'the horns of these beasts exported to Greece are enormous'. The required sense is 'the enormous horns exported to Greece come from these beasts'. Τὰ is therefore required before *ὑπερμεγάρθῃ* also. So in Thuc. 1, 108, 3 τὰ τε τείχη τὰ ἐαυτῶν τὰ μακρὰ ἀπέτελεσαν the second τὰ is omitted in part of the tradition.

127 ἐπέσχε ὁ στρατὸς αὐτοῦ στρατοπεδεύμενος [τὴν] παρὰ θάλασσαν χώραν τοσὴνδε. Τοσὸσδε neither does nor can take the article.

153, 4 τὰ τοιαῦτα γὰρ ἔργα οὐ πρὸς ἅπαντος ἀνδρὸς νενόμικα [γίνεσθαι].

With *γίνεσθαι* the meaning is 'I do not believe that such deeds are done by everybody'. Needless to say, that is the fact. Delete *γίνεσθαι* as an attempt to

explain the construction of *πρός*, and you have the required sense 'I do not think such deeds are characteristic of everybody'. Compare 5, 12, 3 οὔτε Περσικὰ ἦν οὔτε Λυδία τὰ ποιούμενα ἐκ τῆς γυναικός, οὔτε πρὸς τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας οὐδαμῶν.

161, 2 ὅσον μὲν νυν <χρόνον> παντὸς τοῦ Ἑλλήνων στρατοῦ ἐδέου ἡγήεσθαι, ἐξήρκεε ἡμῖν ἡσυχίην ἄγειν.

The editors do not even attempt to quote support for the preposterous notion that ὅσον means 'as long as'. Χρόνον was omitted through the homoeoteleuton with νυν.

Ibid., 3 μάτην γὰρ ἂν ὦδε παράλῳν Ἑλλήνων στρατὸν πλείστον εἶμεν ἐκτημένοι.

It is difficult to believe that παράλος στρατός, 'a sea-side army', can mean 'navy'. I should prefer to suppose a lacuna of this nature: μάτην γὰρ ἂν ὦδε παράλῳν <γῆν οἰκέοντες ναυτικὸν> Ἑλλήνων κτλ.

Ibid. οὗτω οὐκ ὁνειδὸς οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἐστι λέγειν ταῦτα.

Weil conjectured ἀεικές; perhaps ἀναιδές is nearer the mark.

199 Τρηχίς δὲ πόλις ἀπὸ τοῦ Μέλανος τούτου ποταμοῦ πέντε στάδια ἀπέχει. ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ εὐρύτατόν ἐστι πάσης τῆς χώρας ταύτης ἐκ τῶν ὀρέων ἐς θάλασσαν κατ' ἃ Τρηχίς πεπόλισται.

'A must refer to ὀρέων. But the required meaning is 'at the point where Trachis stands', an explanation of ταύτῃ. For that κατ' ὃ is necessary.

209, 2 γέλῳτά με ἔθεν λέγοντα τὰ περ ὥρων ἐκβησόμενα πρήγματα ταῦτα.

Reiske's τῇ περ, printed by Hude and many others, is no improvement. Τῇ περ cannot introduce an indirect question, and 'speaking in exactly the way that I saw things would go' is nonsense,¹ nor again can πρήγματα ταῦτα be the object of λέγοντα, in the sense of 'talking about'. Moreover ἐκβαίνειν means not 'turn out', but 'happen'; so that πρήγματα ταῦτα cannot be the subject. These considerations and the need for an article to πρήγματα suggest τὰ περ ὥρων ἐκβησόμενα <κατὰ τὰ> πρήγματα ταῦτα.

VIII 62, 1 σημαίνων δὲ ταῦτα, τῷ λόγῳ διέβαινε ἐς Εὐρυβιάδην, λέγων μάλλον ἐπεστραμμένα.

The tense of σημαίνων is intolerable not so much because of the looseness of present for aorist as because it produces a wrong meaning. For the present participle inevitably qualifies διέβαινε, 'with this significance he addressed himself to Eurybiades'. But the sense is merely 'having said this'; what Themistocles says to Eurybiades has no connection with his words to Adimantus. Cf. 8, 111, 1 οἱ μὲν ταῦτα σημεινάντες ἀπέπλεον ὀπίσω. So ἐσήμαινε is substituted in some MSS for ἐσήμηνε 8, 8, 3; 21, 2.

97, 2 ἐκ παντὸς νόου παρσκευάσται μένων πολέμῳσιν.

Some of the instances of future prolativ infinitive (collected by Goodwin § M.T. 113) are guaranteed by the form; but as there is no such thing as MS authority between -ῆσαι and -ῆσειν, we should be chary of admitting such a future with a verb after which there is no other example of it and which Herodotus himself uses seven times elsewhere with the present or aorist.

107, 1 Ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέρην ἐς τοσοῦτον ἐγίνετο, τῆς δὲ νυκτὸς κτλ.

Elsewhere (e.g. 126, 1; 9, 18, 3) ἐς τοσοῦτον ἐγίνετο is personal, which suggests ταῦτα μὲν τῆς ἡμέρης.

¹ Contrast § 5 ἦν μὴ ταῦτά τοι ἐκβῆ τῇ ἐγὼ λέγω (sc. ἐκβῆσθαι αὐτά).

112, 3 καίτοι Καρυστίοσι γε οὐδὲν <μᾶλλον> τοῦτου εἵνεκα τοῦ κακοῦ ὑπερβολὴ ἐγένετο.

This is preferable to van Herwerden's οὐδεμία.

IX 31, 1 οἱ δὲ τῶι μὲν νυν ταχθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ Ἀσώπῳ ἐστρατοπεδεύοντο.

This is the conclusion of a list which began (28, 2) ἐτάσσοντο ὧδε οἱ ἐπιφοιτῶντές τε καὶ οἱ ἀρχὴν ἐλθόντες Ἑλλήνων. This suggests οὕτω, which would also relieve the isolation of ταχθέντες.

71, 2 ἤριστευσαν Ποσειδώνιος τε καὶ Φιλοκύναι καὶ Ἀμομφάρετος Σπαρτιήτης.

Better than Krüger's Σπαρτιῆται or Stein's Πιτανήτης is Σπαρτιήτησι.

104 ὁδοὺς αἱ διέφερον ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους.

δι- is not to be emended to δῆ with the Aldine. It is an uncial dittography of αἱ.

117 ἐδέοντο τῶν στρατηγῶν ὅπως <ἀν> ἀπάγοιεν σφέας ὀπίσω.

Ἄν is present in Herodotus's four other examples of ὅπως with optative in object clauses (1, 91, 2; 2, 126, 1; 3, 44, 1; 5, 98, 4), and it is a particle readily absorbed or generated by ἀπ-.

Finally three amusing passages where editors have forgotten to convert false readings into Ionic before putting them in the text: 5, 77, 3 (except Abicht) εἶχον ἐν φυλακῇ ἐν πέδαις δῆσαντες; 7, 59, 2 τελευταία αὐτοῦ Σέρρειον ἄκρη ὀνομαστή; 177 (Hude) οἱ μὲν οὖν χῶροι οὗτοι ἐφαίνοντο ἐπιτήδευοι.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

SYDNEY UNIVERSITY.

MACTARE—MACVLA?

THE very ingenious and closely reasoned article of Mr. L. R. Palmer (*C.Q.* XXXII, p. 57) seems to us to deserve examination, the more so as we totally disagree with his views, both from the point of view of etymology and that of *Religionsforschung*. To put his conclusions briefly, he supposes *mactus* to be derived from a hypothetical verb *macio*, signifying 'bespatter, sprinkle'; *mactus* then would properly mean 'sprinkled' (with wine, blood, milk or some other fluid used in sacrifice), and might also be used of the substance which was sprinkled or poured, thus accounting for the double construction of the secondary verb *mactare* (*aliquid alicui* or *aliquem aliqua re*). In particular, Mr. Palmer supposes that *macte uirtute* alludes to the blood with which the warrior thus addressed is besprinkled, and so to his *tabu* condition. To the whole of this construction we object, holding that the old derivation from the root MAG is correct (though a verb **mago* is as hypothetical as Mr. Palmer's **macio*)¹ and that *mactus* signifies 'increased', 'made greater or stronger', *mactare* properly 'to put someone in the condition of being *mactus*', and by an easy transition 'to sacrifice a victim' (to a deity, to make him *mactus*).

Linguistically, Mr. Palmer's derivation of *mactare* from **macio* is of course irreproachable, cf., e.g., *lacto* from *lacio*, a verb which would be lost but for a quotation in Paul. Fest., pp. 25, 14; 103, 25. He aptly compares **macio*, *mactus*, *macto*, *magmentum* with *apio*, *aptus*, *apto*, *ammentum*. But when he goes on to state that *macula* belongs to *macio* as *co(a)pula* to *apio*, and on this basis ascribes to **macio* the meaning 'bespatter, sprinkle', he unwittingly runs foul of two obstacles. (1) The original meaning of *macula* seems to be a natural spot, as on the skin of a beast, not a spot made by sprinkling, see the *Thesaurus* and Ernout-Meillet s.u. (2) Feminine *-l*-derivatives of Latin verbs do not denote the result of the action expressed by the verb, but the instrument with which that action is performed; cf., e.g., *apio*—*co(a)pula*, *capio*—*capula*, *ferio*—*ferula*. The same applies to the neuter derivatives in *-l*, e.g., *iacio*—*iaculum*, *specio*—*speculum*, although here two exceptions are known, *templum* and *exemplum* (Stolz-Leumann par. 172 IVB). Therefore, if **macio* ever existed, *macula* is not likely to have more to do with it than, e.g., *facula* with *facio*, and the meaning of **macio* is thus unknown.

Objection must further be raised to Mr. Palmer's suggestion that only the derivation of *macto* from **macio*, 'sprinkle', gives a satisfactory explanation of the double construction *mactare aliquid alicui* and *aliquem aliqua re*. The parallel construction of *dono* furnishes a fully satisfactory one, see Hey in *A.L.L.*, xiii, p. 224 and Ernout-Meillet s.u. *macto*.

It thus appears that from the purely linguistic point of view Mr. Palmer's theory is by no means so free of difficulty as he would have it. Semasiologically, it receives less support than he supposes from the passages, very interesting in themselves, which he adduces and analyses in his article. He begins, as is proper, with the prayers in Cato, *de agri cultura* 132, 1 and 134, 3, the phrase in question being, in both passages, *macte uino inferio esto*. Here, in passing, it should be noted that a small lexicographical slip of Mr. Palmer's somewhat weakens his argument; he imagines, it would seem, that *uinum inferium* means wine of the *inferi*, or, as he

¹ If, that is, the common dogma is true that a participle in *-to-* necessarily implies the existence of a corresponding verb. To us, in view of

such phenomena as Eng. *left-handed*, Lat. *barbatus*, this appears pure assumption.

render
literal
deceiv
of off
offere
drink-
speak
which
deret a
point
adject
condit
eripiat
obligab
but les
somev

T
Iuppit
whate
visibl
not so
of cou
itself
power
more

W
suppo
editio
strivin
his pr
Iuppit
petessit
in line
curiou
the zer
not to
would
lustras
nualis
rite of
et lacto

¹ Pau
id quoc
ponebat
offered
tion of t
tion of
eximius—
Fest. Pa
find som
make it
xx. 3, 7,
libatur
trusted,
² As i

renders it, 'infernal wine'. As a matter of fact, it means simply sacrificial wine, literally wine which is brought in, *infertur*. Despite the assonance, which apparently deceived Verrius Flaccus,¹ and despite the fact that the cognate fem. *inferiae* is used of offerings to the dead,² *uinum inferium* is, as it happens, not only used of wine offered to a celestial deity but, so far as we can find, only of such, and never of a drink-offering to any of the powers below, god or ghost. Cato uses the phrase in speaking of the worship of Iuppiter; Arnobius³ is very merry over the difficulties which would arise if all the five Minervas of Hellenistic speculation *sibi quisque desideret aut turis suffimenta libari aut ex pateris aureis inferia uina defundi*. More to the point is his quotation from Trebatius,⁴ which makes it plain exactly how and why the adjective was used at all, namely *ne uinum omne omnino quod in cellis atque apothecis est conditum, ex quibus illud quod effunditur promptum est, esse sacrum incipiat et ex usibus eripiat humanis. addito ergo hoc uerbo solum erit quod infertur sacrum nec religione obligabitur ceterum*. It is a capital illustration of the legalistic element in Roman cult, but lends no support at all to the ghost-theory of religious origins which haunts and somewhat damages so admirable a work as Eitrem's *Opferritus*.

The passage of Cato, then, proves no more than that on occasion one said to Iuppiter, 'be thou *macte* with this offered wine', whatever *macte* may mean, and whatever its construction may be.⁵ The fact that Terminus, Ianus and other deities visible in material form, to say nothing of the altars and other sacred objects of those not so patent to the senses, were on occasion sprinkled with blood or other liquid is of course perfectly consistent either with Mr. Palmer's theory that the word *mactus* itself means 'besprinkled' or with the common opinion that it means 'increased in power', for then the sprinkling was done to give the deity in question more power, more *mana* or *numen*.

We come now to the curious passage from Cicero in which Mr. Palmer finds support for his views.⁶ For full comment we must refer readers to the elaborate edition of Professor Pease; for the present it is enough to note that the author, striving after poetical expression, loses, as usual, the good taste which accompanies his prose and indulges in some very odd phraseology. Thus we have *flammatus Iuppiter* in line 1 for the sky as composed of celestial or elemental fire; the archaic *petessit* in the third line; a long periphrasis for *planetae* in line 8; a piece of preciousness in line 15, *tremulos* with the construction and meaning of a participle; in line 18 the curious *concreto lumine* for the light of the full moon; *magnum ad columen* in line 21 for the zenith; the enigmatic *glomerans* of line 35, and other things as strange. So it is not to be wondered at if in line 14 we have something not too easy to explain; it would be more surprising if we found normal, technical ritual language. Down to *lustrasti* all is clear enough; *tu quoque*, says Urania, *cum tumulos Albano in monte nivalis lustrasti*, 'you also (saw portents) when you went through the (processional) rite of purification about the snowy mounds on the Alban mount'. She continues *et laeto mactasti lacte Latinas*. The phrase *laeto lacte* is easy enough; it is abundant

¹ Paulus *epit. Fest.*, p. 100, 9: *inferium uinum id quod in sacrificando infra labrum paterae ponebatur*. I.e., he knew it was not wine offered to the *inferi*, but not seeing the connection of the word with *infero* (it is indeed a formation of a very rare type, paralleled only by *eximius*—*eximo* and its own cousin *arferia aqua*, *Fest. Paul.*, p. 10, 23, from *adfero*) he sought to find some explanation which should at least make it 'lower' than something. Isidore, *etym.*, xx. 3, 7, has the true explanation, *quod altario libatur atque offertur*, but, if his MSS. are to be trusted, the false form *infertum*.

² As in Catullus 101, 8 and a score of other

places. Here the false etymology from *inferi* seems to have confined the word to this use.

³ *Aduers. nat.*, iv, 16, p. 155, 2 Reifferscheid.

⁴ *Arnob.*, vii, 31, p. 264, 22 sqq.

⁵ If it is the voc. of a perf. part., such a construction is not found elsewhere till Augustus, and not at all commonly till Silver poetry; if an adv., we have the double oddity of an adv. formed directly from a participle and of the syntax, ill-supported by such phrases as *bene est*, *male est*, which are not in the imperative.

⁶ Cicero *de divin.*, i, 17-22, especially 18 (lines 13-14).

or perhaps fertility-bringing milk, and the only comment necessary is that we learn from the passage that in the worship of Alban Iuppiter the old usage of making libation with milk and not wine was kept up. Remains then *mactasti Latinas*. It would seem that the substantive to be supplied is *ferias*; to supply *victimas* or *hostias* is surely asking too much of the reader's power of guessing riddles, especially as the festival was often called simply *Latinas*.¹ This being so, whatever we suppose *mactare* to mean, the phrase involves a *translatio*, for properly it is either the god or the victim which one *mactat*. We fail to see that it makes the figure any more natural to render the verb 'besprinkle' than to interpret it as 'increase, give more *mana* to' the ceremony. Of course no one denies that the particular rite mentioned here was one of libation, as in the parallels cited by Mr. Palmer; but it is a long way from that to supposing that 'sprinkle' is what the verb means here, and equally far to the conjecture of Mr. Palmer that we have 'an archaic phrase from ritual vocabulary'. We think we have shown that the phrase is a piece of artificial rhetoric; and if this is so, the only meaning the verb would have would be the one which contemporary scholarship assured Cicero (the friend, it should be remembered, of Varro) that it must have.

The fragment of Varro (*Menipp.* 2, Bue.) is beside the point, as Mr. Palmer has unfortunately misinterpreted it; *tepidio lacte satur porcus* means that the animal is a sucking-pig, fresh from the warm udders of the old sow, and has nothing to do with its preparations for sacrifice, which are summed up in the two words *mola mactatus*, 'offered up with (a sprinkling of) *mola salsa*'.

Finally in handling Seneca, *epp.* 66, 50, Mr. Palmer has again been misled by a piece of rhetoric. Seneca throws little light on Roman ritual, especially the earlier ritual; one gets the impression that he neither knew nor cared much about it. To him, *macte uirtute* was a phrase to be found in Cicero, Vergil, Horace and other writers whom he had known from his school days, and, as Mr. Palmer rightly says, it meant something like 'bravo!' and hardly anything more definite. When, therefore, he says *macte uirtute esto sanguinolentis ex acie redeuntibus dicitur*, it is a rather profound misunderstanding of his limitations to suppose that he means more than 'We do not say, "Well done, brave boys!" save to those who come from the fray with blood on them'. But let him be as well acquainted with ancient ritual vocabulary, Roman or other, as anyone chooses to imagine; what, on Mr. Palmer's theory, would *macte uirtute esto* mean? 'Be sprinkled with valour'? This surely is as strange a method of ridding warriors of the pollution of blood as ever was heard of. 'Be hallowed, ennobled by your valour' is more intelligible, but Mr. Palmer rejects this, as we also do, though for different reasons. 'Be ye made pure by your valour' is in itself possible; but until some example is found of a people believing in blood-pollution and at the same time holding that the moral condition of the person who had incurred it would act as a substitute for proper ritual, we need not linger over it.

It appears, then, that none of the passages adduced to support Mr. Palmer really does so when closely examined. We are thus left with the general likeliness of one meaning or the other, 'increased' or 'sprinkled', being right. Here, as it seems to us, one consideration after another tells in favour of the older view. Firstly, we must remember that Cato, in the passages quoted, gives us not only the formula *macte uino inferio esto*, which could without violating common sense or general probability be made to mean 'be sprinkled with this libation of sacrificial wine', but also *macte istace dape pollucenda esto*. Are we to assume that originally it was the custom to throw the *dapes* at the god, or his altar or shrine, so that the food of which it was composed was spattered about? All we know of ritual, at least that of the

¹ So often that even Lewis and Short have heard of it, and that despite the fact that it

occurs in Livy; they cite, *inter alia*, Livy v, 17, 2; 19, 1, s.u. *Latinus*.

celestial gods, tells us that the food was laid orderly on an altar or a table. How, then, can it be said to 'besprinkle' anyone or anything? It is very strange if in one and the same formula the same ritual word in one clause keeps its supposed original meaning 'besprinkle' and in another has moved so far from it that it signifies no more than a vague 'here is an offering for you'.

But more than this, we have the construction of the phrase *macte esto* to consider. We have mentioned (see note 5, p. 221) two explanations which have been put forward of its syntax, and found both profoundly unsatisfactory. The only remaining possibility, as it seems to us, is to make *macte* a fossilized word, used as if it were indeclinable, though originally it was not. If so, the only possible explanation seems to be that it is a vocative, and as such used originally by itself. In other words, there was a time when worshippers did not say *macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto* but simply cried *macte!* to the god at some point of the rite, presumably after the sacrifice had been made. This *macte!* then came to be used with verbs, first with the imperative and afterwards with other parts, till Livy actually makes it take the place of an acc. sing. (*iuberem macte uirtute esse*, ii, 12, 14). For parallels to such fossilized vocatives we need look no farther than a Homeric grammar (Monro², par. 96). Now what did this vocative mean originally? 'Oh besprinkled one'? If so, it differed from every other intelligible epithet applied to a god which we know of as in Roman usage. They all refer to the functions of the deity, as *dapalis*, *opifera*, or at least differentiate the god or goddess of the particular shrine from some other of the same name, as (*Minerva*) *Capta*. None alludes in this curious way to a mere detail of the ritual, and that too a detail which in some cases, as the offering of a *dapes*, would not be true. But 'Oh thou increased in power!' seems a very natural thing to say when one has just seen to it that that increase should take place, as natural as 'Oh Zeus Accomplisher!' in the mouth of one who badly wants something to be accomplished.¹ To increase the power of a deity by appropriate ritual seems to be the aim and object of ancient sacrifice in its earliest form, before it was thought of as a present to win his favour; it is most understandable that this aim should be mentioned in a Roman equivalent of the Greek *όλολυγή*.

O. SKUTSCH.

H. J. ROSE.

ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY.

¹ Aeschylus, *Agam.* 973.

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Andrewes, A.**, Eunomia, 89 ff.
 Aristotle's hymn to virtue, 182 ff.
Armstrong, A. H., the gods in Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, 190 ff.
- Beare, W.**, side-entrances and *πρωκτοί* in the Hellenistic theatre, 205 ff.
Bowra, C. M., the epigram on the fallen of Coronea, 80 ff.; Aristotle's hymn to virtue, 182 ff.
- Campbell, A. Y.**, notes on Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 135 f.
Choephoroi, four notes on the, 1 ff.
 Cornelius Gallus, the origin of, 39 ff.
 Coronea, the epigram on the fallen of, 80 ff.
- Democritus' theory of cognition, 47 ff.
 Diodorus Siculus xvi, the sources of, 137 ff.
Dodds, E. R., four notes on the *Choephoroi*, 1 ff.
 Dracontides, the Constitution of, 152 ff.
- Eunomia, 89 ff.
 Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, notes on, 135 f.; *Medea*, a new papyrus fragment of, 45 f.; a new collation of the text in the Jerusalem palimpsest, 197 ff.
- gods in Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, the, 190 ff.
Gow, A. S. F., the thirteenth idyll of Theocritus, 10 ff.
- Hackforth, R.**, the aviary theory in the *Theaetetus*, 27 ff.
Hammond, N. G. L., the sources of Diodorus Siculus xvi, 137 ff.
 Hellenistic theatre, side-entrances and *πρωκτοί* in the, 205 ff.
 Herodotus, notes on, 211 ff.
Hirst, Margaret E., the portents in Horace, *Odes* I. 2. (1-20), 7 ff.
 Horace, *Odes* I. 2. 1-20, the portents in, 7 ff.
- Jerusalem palimpsest, a new collation of the text of Euripides in the, 197 ff.
- lexical notes, 109 ff.
Lockwood, J. F., further lexical notes, 109 ff.
Lorimer, H. L., *πρόλος* and *πρωτέες*, 129 ff.
Lucas, Hans, Martial's *Kalendae Nataliciae*, 5 f.
- mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
macte, mactare, macula, 57 ff.
 Martial's *Kalendae Nataliciae*, 5 f.
- Munro, J. A. R.**, Theramenes against Lysander, 18 ff.; the Constitution of Dracontides, 152 ff.
Murphy, N. R., the 'comparison of lives' in Plato's *Philebus*, 116 ff.
- Page, Denys**, a new papyrus fragment of Euripides' *Medea*, 45 f.
Palmer, L. R., *macte, mactare, macula*, 57 ff.
Περὶ Τύχης, the authorship of the, 133 f.
 Philodemus on *ethos* in music, 174 ff.
 Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, the gods in, 190 ff.
 Plato's *Philebus*, the 'comparison of lives' in, 116 ff.
 Plutarch's *Timoleon*, the sources of, 65 ff.
Powell, J. E., the archetype of Thucydides, 75 ff.; the Cretan manuscripts of, 103 ff.; notes on Herodotus (third article), 211 ff.
πρόλος and *πρωτέες*, 129 ff.
- Richards, G. C.**, the authorship of the *Περὶ Τύχης*, 133 f.
Rose, H. J., and O. Skutsch, *mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
- Skutsch, O.**, and H. J. Rose, *mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
 Socrates, the pseudo-Platonic, 167 ff.
Spranger, J. A., a new collation of the text of Euripides in the Jerusalem palimpsest, 197 ff.
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS:
 American Journal of Philology, 126 ff.
 Classical Philology, 125
 Indogerm. Forschungen, 63 f., 128
 Neue Jahrbücher, 63, 128
 Philologus, 63
- Syme, R.**, the origin of Cornelius Gallus, 39 ff.
- Tarrant, Dorothy**, the pseudo-Platonic Socrates, 167 ff.
Theaetetus, the aviary theory in the, 27 ff.
 Theocritus, the thirteenth idyll of, 10 ff.
 Theramenes against Lysander, 18 ff.
 Thucydides, the archetype of, 75 ff.; the Cretan manuscripts of, 103 ff.
- Todd, O. J.**, *Τριταγωνιστής*: a reconsideration, 30 ff.
Τριταγωνιστής: a reconsideration, 30 ff.
- Weiss, Helene**, Democritus' theory of cognition, 47 ff.
Westlake, H. D., the sources of Plutarch's *Timoleon*, 65 ff.
- Wilkinson, L. P.**, Philodemus on *ethos* in music, 174 ff.

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

- Aelian:—
V.H. viii. (19), 186
- Aeschines:—
 ii. (19), 36; (76), 20; iii. (133), 81; v. (31), 90; [*Epist.*] xii. (1), 32
- Aeschylus:—
Ag. (973), 223; (1481 ff.), 4
Cho. (283 ff.), 1 f.; (375 ff.), 2; (481-2), 2 f.; (824 ff.), 3 f.; (909-11), 4
Sept. (194), 4
Supp. (905), 80
- Alcman:—
 fr. (44), 89; see also 101
- Ammonius:—
de diff. Verb. pp. 52, 54 (Valcknaer), 186
- Anacreon:—
 (Diehl fr. 102. 1-2), 87
- Andocides:—
 i. (99), 24; i. (142), 20; iii. (11-12), 18; (12), 18; (21), 20; (31), (39), 19
- Ant. Lib.*:—
 (26)=Nicand. fr. (48), 11
- Apollonius Rhodius:—
 ii. (707), 13; (1207), 15; (1254-5), 14; (1262), 16
- Aripbron:—
 (Diehl ii. p. 131), 182; (4-7), 183
- Aristides Quintilianus:—
 (p. 95M), 178
- Aristophanes:—
Ach. (18), 1
Av. (451-9), (539-47), 184
Ran. (258), 11; (1052 f.), 36
- Aristotle:—
'Aperá, Hymn to, 182 ff.; (9-11), 188
A.P. 1449a. (15-19), 30; (16 ff.), 31; 1451b. (23-26), 36
Ath. Pol. 4. (3), 165; 30. (2), 161, 163; 30. (3), 163; 31. (3), 164; 33. (2), 165; 34. (1), 20; 34. (3), 18, 19, 23, 153; 35. (1), 25, 155 f.; 158; 35. (3), 36. (1), 156; 37. (1), 162; 37. (2), 161; 39. (6), 25
de anima i. 2. (404a. 27), 47 ff.
de gen. et corr. i. 1. (315b. 6 ff.), 51 f.; i. 8. (325a. 13), (325a. 23-27), 50
de somniis 462a. (12), 1 f.
Eth. Nic. ii. 1. (1103a. 26, 27), 188; iii. 3. (1112a) 23
Metaph. iii. (1009b. 12), 47 ff.; (1010a. 1-3), (1051b. 23-4), 54; (1051b. 23), 55; iv. (3), 53
Pol. (1294a), 91; (1307a), 95; (1337a), 179; (1338b. 29 f.), 31; (1339), 175; (1339a), 180; (1340a), 178; (1341a), 177; viii. (5, 8, 9), 178
[*Problem* xix. (27)], 177
Rhet. iii. 5. 5. (1407b), 84
Top. ii. (611b. 22), 187; (Diehl fr. 3), 88
- Aristoxenus:—
 ii. (31), 175
- Arnobius:—
adv. nat. iv. (16), vii. (31), 221
- Athenaeus:—
 xv. (694a), 185; (696a), 182
- Augustine:—
Conf. x. (33), 178
- Bacchylides:—
 xii. (158), 89; xiii. (175-181), 187
- Callimachus:—
Bath of Pallas (85 ff.), 87
H. i. (52), iii. (240), 129
- Cato:—
agr. 132. (1), 59, 61, 220 f.; 134. (3), 59, 220 f.; 134. (4), 61
- Cicero:—
ad fam. x. 32. (5), 39
de fin. i. (71), 180
in Verrem ii. 3. (69), 5. (181), 42
poem. de cons. (Div. i. 18), 60
Vat. (14), 61
- Corinna:—
 (Diehl fr. 5, 74-8), 83 f.
- Cornelius Nepos:—
Lys. (1), 19
- Democritus:—
 fr. B. (11), 48
- Demosthenes:—
 xviii. (129), 35; (180), 36; (209), (262), (265), (267), 35; xix. (10), 32; (65), 20; (199 f.), 35; (246 f.), 34; (247), 30; (337), 35; xlii. (25, 32), 19; *de Cor.* (289), 86
- Dio Cassius:—
 xlv. (17), 7; liii. 23. (5), 39
- Diodorus:—
 vii. (fr. 12, 1 Vogel), 90 f., 95 f.; xiii. (107), 19; xiv. (3), 19, 23, 155, 156; (4), 154, 156; (10), (13), 19; (32), 160, 162; xv. (63), 20; xvi. 5. (1), 137; 70. (5), 140; 71. (3), 143; 76. (6), 149; 82. (6), 140 f.
- Diogenes Laertius:—
 v. (27), 182; x. (6), 181
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus:—
Ép. ad Pompeium, 133
- Ephorus:—
F.G.H. 70 f. (149), 101
- Epicurus:—
Letter to Menoeceus iii. 12. (4), 194
- Euphorion:—
A.P. vi. (279-82), 13
- Euripides:—
Andr. (103-16), 86
Cycl. (658), 1
Hec. (67), 81
H.F. (1041), 81
Hel. (891), 136
I.T. (116-7), (183), (219), (412), (413), (573 f.), 135; (591-2), (633), (819), (1055), (1386), 136
Med. (1156-60), 46; (1165-77), 45; (1191-9), 46
Phoen. (844), 81
- Eustathius:—
 (600, 45 ff.), 130
- Heliodorus:—
Aethiop. vi. (14), 1
- Herodotus:—
 i. (64-66), 92 f.; (97), 89; ii. (124), 90; v. (89), 83; see pp. 211-19 *passim*
- Hesiod:—
Op. (289-93), 187
- Homer:—
Iliad v. (744), xi. (49), 129; xi. (462), 11; xii. (77), xv. (517), xxi. (90), 129

- Homer—continued:—**
Od. vi. (66), 3; ix. (34), 183; xii. (194), 1; xvii. (485 f.), 89 f.; xxii. (299-301), 12
Hom. Hymn.:—
 iii. (91-2), 80; iv. (561), 83; xxx. (11), 90;
Hermes (562-3), 84
Horace:—
Epod. ii. (70), 6
Odes i. 2. (1-20), 7 ff.; (49-50), 7; i. 35. (33-4), (38-40), ii. 1. (6-8), 9; iv. 13. (8), 183
Sat. i. 3. (87), 6
[Inscriptions]:—
I.G. iii. 1. (171), iv². 1. (132), 182; Kaibel no. 243. (12), 183
Ion of Chios:—
 (Diehl fr. 8. 1-2), 88
Isidorus:—
Ety. vi. 19. (17), 186
Isocrates:—
 viii. (20), 19; xiv. (31), xviii. (29), 20; (40), 24
Lycimnius:—
 185
Livy:—
 ii. 12. (14), 223
Lucian:—
Peregr. (36), 32
Pro Lapsu (6), 182
Tyr. (22), 34
Lysias:—
 xii. (43), 18; (50), 21; (55), 159; (62), (64), 21; (68-9), 20; (69, 70), 21; (70), 20; (71-76), 24, 156 f.; (71), 153; (73), 152; (76), 160; (77), 19; (78), (84-5), 21; xiii. (5), 19; (7 ff.), 18; (7), 25; (8), 19 f.; (9-11), 21; (9-10), 20; (11), 22; (12), 19; (13-17), 23; (14), 19, 20; (17), 25; (30), 23; (30-34), 25; xxx. (7, 8), 161; (10-14), 19
Macedonius:—
Paean (27-8), 185
Macrobius:—
Sat. i. 15. (18), (19), 6
Manilius:—
 ii. (8-10), (57-8), 134
Martial:—
 iv. 66. (3), viii. 44. (11), 6; viii. (64), 5; x. 63. (5), xii. 32. (1), 6
Mela:—
 ii. (75), 43
Menander:—
Hypobol. frg. 484. (K), 34
Theophr. frg. 223 (K), (16 f.), 34
Mimnermus:—
 fr. 1. (3), 183
Ovid:—
Am. i. 15. (29), 39
Met. xv. (782-98), 7
Papyri:—
 Hib. Pap. i. (13), 179
Pausanias:—
 i. 29. (6), 85; ii. 11. (6), 186
Περὶ Τύφους:—
 (36), 133 f.; xiii. (3), (4), 134
Philodemus:—
περὶ μουσικῆς i. (fr. 18), 177; iii. (fr. 52), 178, 179; iv. (col. 2), 177; (col. 3), 176; (col. 11, 18), 179; (col. 14, 8-13), (col. 16), 181; (col. 24), 178 f.; (col. 26, 5), 180; (col. 29, 12 ff.), 175; (col. 29, 32-5), (col. 36), 180; (col. 38), 181; v. (col. 29, 17), 175
Philodemus—continued:—
περὶ ποιημάτων iv. (col. 4), (col. 8), 176; v. (col. 29), 180
Phrynichus:—
 (fr. 13 Nauck), 183
Pindar:—
Isth. i. (5), 183
Nem. i. (67-8), 81; iv. (84), 184
Ol. ix. (110), 81; x. (4, fr. 194), 186
Pyth. i. (48), 81; iv. (188), 12
Plato:—
[Alcib. Prior] (103a), (105a), (105d), 171
Apol. 31 (d), 170 f.; 40 (b), 41 (d), 170
[Axioch.] 365 (a), 368 (d), 369 (b), 170; 372 (a), 168
Epist. vii. 324 (c), 25
[Evastae] 139 (a), 168, 169; 132 (b), 169
[Hipp. Maj.] 304 (d), 168
Laus 668 (a), 179; 668 (b), 176; (669), 177; (669 ff.), 175; (728 ff.), 120; 753 (b), 162; 905 (d)-907 (b), 192
[“Opo”] 413 (e), 91
Phileb. 11 (b), 117
Rep. 339 (b), 177; 380 (d), 188; (398-400), 175; 414 (b), 162; 443 (d), (e), 119; 537 (a-d), 162; 581 (b), 119; 581 (e), 116; (581-3), (583-6), 116
Theaet. 195. b. (9), 196. (b), 199. (b), 27; 199. (c-d), 27 f.; 199. (e), 200. (b), 28; 200. b. (1-2), 28 f.; 200. b. (5), 29; (Diehl no. 6), 87
[Theages] 128 (d), 171; 128 (e), 129 (a), (d), (e), 131 (a), 172
Plautus:—
Amph. (1062), (1067), (1130), (1143), 209
Pliny the Elder:—
N.H. iii. (130), 40; xxxiii. (143), 41; xxxv. (70, 137), 187
Pliny the Younger:—
Ep. vii. 27. (§ 9), 1
Plotinus:—
Περὶ Ἱπποκράτους iii. 2. (9), 193 f.; iii. 2. p. 484 Creuz., 31
Plutarch:—
Lycurgus v. (4), 91; (vi), 95
Lysand. (13), (14), 19; (15), 20, 26; (21), 21, 23; (23), 31; (26), 100
Mor. 318 (a), 89
Nic. (17), 86
non posse . . . (12), 181; (13), 180
Per. (18), 85
Prac. Ger. Reip. 21. (816f-817a), 31
Qu. Rom. (11), 186
Simp. Quaest. i. 1. (5), 185
Pollux:—
 iv. (124), 31; (125-7), 206
Polyaenus:—
 i. 45. (5), 20
[Pseudo-Xenophon]:—
‘Aθ. παλ. i. (5, 8), 90
Sallust:—
Cat. (51), 156
Scholia:—
in Demosth. v. (6), xix. (247), 32
in Eur. Phoen. (95), 31
(T) in Hom. Il. xii. (77), xxiii. (130), 130
in Nic. Ther. (15), 83
in Pind. Pyth. ii. (127), 130
in Plat. Gorg. (451e), 185
Seneca:—
Ep. lxvi. (50), 61 f., 222; lxxxviii. (5), 181
Servius:—
 iv. (57), 61; *in Aen.* ix. (641), 57 f.
Sextus:—
D.V. 68a. (59), 51

Simonides:—
(Diehl fr. 37), 187; (83. 3-4), 81; (120. 1-2), 88

Sophocles:—
Ant. (783-4), 183
O.C. (653), 2
Trach. (497-517), 184; (1164-73), 84
(Pearson fr. 361), 187; (771), 85

Strabo:—
(300-301), 89; (362), 95

Strattis:—
frg. 1. (K), 34

Suidas:—
s.v. Ἀβρογάδης, 32; s.v. Σοφοκλῆς, 32

Tacitus:—
Ann. xi. (24), xiii. (27), 41

Theocritus:—
xiii. (7), (10), 13; (14), 13 f.; (22), (23), 14;
(46), 15; (64), 12; (108), 15 f.; (73), 16 f.

Thucydides:—
i. (18), 93 ff.; (89. 1-3), 78; ii. (17. 2), 84;
(22. 2), 85; (36. 4), 78; (42. 4), 77; (63. 1),
78; iv. (28. 3), 76; v. (26), 22; vii. (70. 8),
78; (78. 6), 76; (81. 3), 77; viii. (10. 1),
76; (67), 155; (68), 18

Tibullus:—
i. 1. (36 f.), 61; i. 2. (47 f.), 61; ii. 5. (71 ff.), 7

Tyrtaeus:—
fr. 1. (12), 96; 9. (18), 81; see also 95 ff.

Varro:—
fr. Non. 341. (34), 61; *Menipp.* 2 (Bue.),
222

Virgil:—
Aen. ii. (717 ff.), 62; vi. (229 ff.), 61
Georg. i. (466-488), 7

Vitruvius:—
V. vi. (§ 8), 206

Xenophon:—
Eq. ii. (1), 162
Hell. i. 7. (35), 19; ii. 1. (4), (22-34), (22),
(25), (28), (38), 187; ii. 2. (3), (10), 20;
(11), 19; (13), (14), 20; (16), 20, 22; (16-
19), 21; (17), (18), (19), (19-22), (20), 22;
ii. 3 (1-3), 152; (1-14), 154; (2, 3), 24;
(3), 25; (7), 19, 155; (8), 154; (8, 9), 26;
(13), 156; (15), 18; (17), 24, 155; (18),
159; (20), 161; (21), 158; (24), 18; (25-
26), 24, 154 f.; (41), 158; (48), (51), 162;
ii. 4. (2), 161; (8), 159; (9), (10), 161; (21),
154; (29), 21; iii. 4. (2), 19, 23; (7), (13),
19; iii. 5. (8), 20; vi. 5. (35, 46), 20
Hipparch. i. (11-12), (17-19), 162; ix. (3), 162
Mem. i. 1. (3), (4), 171

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY
 T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.
 FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.
 A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—Times Lit. Supp.

New Volumes, Spring and Summer, 1938

Latin

331. *Ammianus Marcellinus*. Three volumes. Vol. III (Books 27-32). Translated by J. C. Rolfe.
 304, 336. *Celsus DE MEDICINA*. Three volumes. Vols. II and III. Translated by Dr. W. G. Spencer.
 332. *Livy*. Thirteen volumes. Vol. XII (Books 40-42). Translated by the late Evan T. Sage and A. C. Schlesinger.
 328. *Plautus*. Five volumes. Vol. V: STICHTUS, TRINUMMUS, TRUCULENTUS, VIDULARIA, FRAGMENTS. Translated by Paul Nixon.
 329. *Remains of Old Latin*. Four volumes. Vol. III: LUCILIUS, LAWS OF THE XII TABLES. Translated by E. H. Warmington.
 330. *Pliny, NATURAL HISTORY*. Ten volumes. Vol. I (Books 1 and 2). Translated by H. Rackham.
 333, 334. *Varro, DE LINGUA LATINA*. Two volumes. Translated by Roland G. Kent.

Greek

325. *Aristotle, ORGANON*. Two volumes. Vol. I: CATEGORIES, ON INTERPRETATION, translated by H. P. Cooke; PRIOR ANALYTICS, translated by H. Tredennick.
 338. *Aristotle, ON THE HEAVENS*. Translated by W. K. C. Guthrie.
Machines of Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).
Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
 HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 18s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Matcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

DURA-EUROPOS AND ITS ART

By M. ROSTOVITZ

With 24 plates, as well as text figures and maps

15/- net

A fully illustrated account of the recent archaeological discoveries at the famous caravan city of Dura in Syria

PORTRAIT OF SOCRATES

By SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE

6/- net

'... This is a book to read, to think about and to talk about and then read again ...'—*Northern Whig*

'... It is hard to see how the work could have been better done ...'—*A.M.A.*

QUINTILIAN ON EDUCATION

*A Translation of Selected Passages from the
Institutio Oratoria
with an Essay on*

Quintilian, His Environment and His Theory of Education

By W. M. SMAIL

4/6 net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

MACTARE—MACVLA?

THE very ingenious and closely reasoned article of Mr. L. R. Palmer (*C.Q.* XXXII, p. 57) seems to us to deserve examination, the more so as we totally disagree with his views, both from the point of view of etymology and that of *Religionsforschung*. To put his conclusions briefly, he supposes *mactus* to be derived from a hypothetical verb *macio*, signifying 'bespatter, sprinkle'; *mactus* then would properly mean 'sprinkled' (with wine, blood, milk or some other fluid used in sacrifice), and might also be used of the substance which was sprinkled or poured, thus accounting for the double construction of the secondary verb *mactare* (*aliquid alicui* or *aliquem aliqua re*). In particular, Mr. Palmer supposes that *macte uirtute* alludes to the blood with which the warrior thus addressed is besprinkled, and so to his *tabu* condition. To the whole of this construction we object, holding that the old derivation from the root MAG is correct (though a verb **mago* is as hypothetical as Mr. Palmer's **macio*)¹ and that *mactus* signifies 'increased', 'made greater or stronger', *mactare* properly 'to put someone in the condition of being *mactus*', and by an easy transition 'to sacrifice a victim' (to a deity, to make him *mactus*).

Linguistically, Mr. Palmer's derivation of *mactare* from **macio* is of course irreproachable, cf., e.g., *lacto* from *lacio*, a verb which would be lost but for a quotation in Paul. Fest., pp. 25, 14; 103, 25. He aptly compares **macio*, *mactus*, *macto*, *magmentum* with *apio*, *aptus*, *apto*, *ammentum*. But when he goes on to state that *macula* belongs to *macio* as *co(a)pula* to *apio*, and on this basis ascribes to **macio* the meaning 'bespatter, sprinkle', he unwittingly runs foul of two obstacles. (1) The original meaning of *macula* seems to be a natural spot, as on the skin of a beast, not a spot made by sprinkling, see the *Thesaurus* and Ernout-Meillet s.u. (2) Feminine -l-derivatives of Latin verbs do not denote the result of the action expressed by the verb, but the instrument with which that action is performed; cf., e.g., *apio*—*co(a)pula*, *capio*—*capula*, *ferio*—*ferula*. The same applies to the neuter derivatives in -l-, e.g., *iacio*—*iaculum*, *specio*—*speculum*, although here two exceptions are known, *templum* and *exemplum* (Stolz-Leumann par. 172 IVB). Therefore, if **macio* ever existed, *macula* is not likely to have more to do with it than, e.g., *facula* with *facio*, and the meaning of **macio* is thus unknown.

Objection must further be raised to Mr. Palmer's suggestion that only the derivation of *macto* from **macio*, 'sprinkle', gives a satisfactory explanation of the double construction *mactare aliquid alicui* and *aliquem aliqua re*. The parallel construction of *dono* furnishes a fully satisfactory one, see Hey in *A.L.L.*, xiii, p. 224 and Ernout-Meillet s.u. *macto*.

It thus appears that from the purely linguistic point of view Mr. Palmer's theory is by no means so free of difficulty as he would have it. Semasiologically, it receives less support than he supposes from the passages, very interesting in themselves, which he adduces and analyses in his article. He begins, as is proper, with the prayers in Cato, *de agri cultura* 132, 1 and 134, 3, the phrase in question being, in both passages, *macte uino inferio esto*. Here, in passing, it should be noted that a small lexicographical slip of Mr. Palmer's somewhat weakens his argument; he imagines, it would seem, that *uinum inferium* means wine of the *inferi*, or, as he

¹ If, that is, the common dogma is true that a participle in -to- necessarily implies the existence of a corresponding verb. To us, in view of

such phenomena as Eng. *left-handed*, Lat. *barbatus*, this appears pure assumption.

renders i
literally
deceived
of offerin
offered t
drink-off
speaking
which w
deret aut
point is h
adjective
conditum,
eripiatur
obligabit
but lends
somewha

The
Iuppiter,
whatever
visible in
not so pa
of course
itself me
power', f
more man

We
support
edition o
striving a
his prose
Iuppiter i
petessit in
in line 15
curious co
the zenith
not to be
would be
lustrasti
nialis lustr
rite of p
et lacto m

¹ Paulus
id quod in
ponebatur.
offered to
tion of the
tion of a
eximius—ex
Fest. Paul.
find some
make it 'lo
xx. 3, 7, ha
libatur atq
trusted, the

² As in C

renders it, 'infernal wine'. As a matter of fact, it means simply sacrificial wine, literally wine which is brought in, *inferitur*. Despite the assonance, which apparently deceived Verrius Flaccus,¹ and despite the fact that the cognate fem. *inferiae* is used of offerings to the dead,² *uinum inferium* is, as it happens, not only used of wine offered to a celestial deity but, so far as we can find, only of such, and never of a drink-offering to any of the powers below, god or ghost. Cato uses the phrase in speaking of the worship of Iuppiter; Arnobius³ is very merry over the difficulties which would arise if all the five Minervas of Hellenistic speculation *sibi quisque desideret aut turis suffimenta libari aut ex pateris aureis inferia uina defundi*. More to the point is his quotation from Trebatius,⁴ which makes it plain exactly how and why the adjective was used at all, namely *ne uinum omne omnino quod in cellis atque apothecis est conditum, ex quibus illud quod effunditur promptum est, esse sacrum incipiat et ex usibus eripiat humanis. addito ergo hoc uerbo solum erit quod inferitur sacrum nec religione obligabitur ceterum*. It is a capital illustration of the legalistic element in Roman cult, but lends no support at all to the ghost-theory of religious origins which haunts and somewhat damages so admirable a work as Eitrem's *Opferrius*.

The passage of Cato, then, proves no more than that on occasion one said to Iuppiter, 'be thou *macte* with this offered wine', whatever *macte* may mean, and whatever its construction may be.⁵ The fact that Terminus, Ianus and other deities visible in material form, to say nothing of the altars and other sacred objects of those not so patent to the senses, were on occasion sprinkled with blood or other liquid is of course perfectly consistent either with Mr. Palmer's theory that the word *mactus* itself means 'besprinkled' or with the common opinion that it means 'increased in power', for then the sprinkling was done to give the deity in question more power, more *mana* or *numen*.

We come now to the curious passage from Cicero in which Mr. Palmer finds support for his views.⁶ For full comment we must refer readers to the elaborate edition of Professor Pease; for the present it is enough to note that the author, striving after poetical expression, loses, as usual, the good taste which accompanies his prose and indulges in some very odd phraseology. Thus we have *flammatius Iuppiter* in line 1 for the sky as composed of celestial or elemental fire; the archaic *petessit* in the third line; a long periphrasis for *planetae* in line 8; a piece of preciosity in line 15, *tremulus* with the construction and meaning of a participle; in line 18 the curious *concreto lumine* for the light of the full moon; *magnum ad columen* in line 21 for the zenith; the enigmatic *glomerans* of line 35, and other things as strange. So it is not to be wondered at if in line 14 we have something not too easy to explain; it would be more surprising if we found normal, technical ritual language. Down to *lustrasti* all is clear enough; *tu quoque*, says Urania, *cum tumultus Albano in monte niualis lustrasti*, 'you also (saw portents) when you went through the (processional) rite of purification about the snowy mounds on the Alban mount'. She continues *et laeto mactasti lacte Latinas*. The phrase *laeto lacte* is easy enough; it is abundant

¹ Paulus *epit. Fest.*, p. 100, 9: *inferium uinum id quod in sacrificando infra labrum paterae ponebatur*. I.e., he knew it was not wine offered to the *inferi*, but not seeing the connection of the word with *infero* (it is indeed a formation of a very rare type, paralleled only by *eximius*—*eximo* and its own cousin *arferia aqua*, *Fest. Paul.*, p. 10, 23, from *adfero*) he sought to find some explanation which should at least make it 'lower' than something. Isidore, *etym.*, xx, 3, 7, has the true explanation, *quod altario libatur atque offertur*, but, if his MSS. are to be trusted, the false form *inferum*.

² As in Catullus 101, 8 and a score of other

places. Here the false etymology from *inferi* seems to have confined the word to this use.

³ *Aduers. nat.*, iv, 16, p. 155, 2 Reifferscheid.

⁴ *Arnob.*, vii, 31, p. 264, 22 sqq.

⁵ If it is the voc. of a perf. part., such a construction is not found elsewhere till Augustus, and not at all commonly till Silver poetry; if an adv., we have the double oddity of an adv. formed directly from a participle and of the syntax, ill-supported by such phrases as *dono est*, *male est*, which are not in the imperative.

⁶ Cicero *de diuin.*, i, 17-22, especially 18 (lines 13-14).

or perhaps fertility-bringing milk, and the only comment necessary is that we learn from the passage that in the worship of Alban Iuppiter the old usage of making libation with milk and not wine was kept up. Remains then *mactasti Latinas*. It would seem that the substantive to be supplied is *ferias*; to supply *uictimas* or *hostias* is surely asking too much of the reader's power of guessing riddles, especially as the festival was often called simply *Latinae*.¹ This being so, whatever we suppose *mactare* to mean, the phrase involves a *translatio*, for properly it is either the god or the victim which one *mactat*. We fail to see that it makes the figure any more natural to render the verb 'besprinkle' than to interpret it as 'increase, give more *mana* to' the ceremony. Of course no one denies that the particular rite mentioned here was one of libation, as in the parallels cited by Mr. Palmer; but it is a long way from that to supposing that 'sprinkle' is what the verb means here, and equally far to the conjecture of Mr. Palmer that we have 'an archaic phrase from ritual vocabulary'. We think we have shown that the phrase is a piece of artificial rhetoric; and if this is so, the only meaning the verb would have would be the one which contemporary scholarship assured Cicero (the friend, it should be remembered, of Varro) that it must have.

The fragment of Varro (*Menipp.* 2, Bue.) is beside the point, as Mr. Palmer has unfortunately misinterpreted it; *tepido lacte satur porcus* means that the animal is a sucking-pig, fresh from the warm udders of the old sow, and has nothing to do with its preparations for sacrifice, which are summed up in the two words *mola mactatus*, 'offered up with (a sprinkling of) *mola salsa*'.

Finally in handling Seneca, *ep.* 66, 50, Mr. Palmer has again been misled by a piece of rhetoric. Seneca throws little light on Roman ritual, especially the earlier ritual; one gets the impression that he neither knew nor cared much about it. To him, *macte uirtute* was a phrase to be found in Cicero, Vergil, Horace and other writers whom he had known from his school days, and, as Mr. Palmer rightly says, it meant something like 'bravo!' and hardly anything more definite. When, therefore, he says *macte uirtute esto sanguinolentis ex acie redeuntibus dicitur*, it is a rather profound misunderstanding of his limitations to suppose that he means more than 'We do not say, "Well done, brave boys!" save to those who come from the fray with blood on them'. But let him be as well acquainted with ancient ritual vocabulary, Roman or other, as anyone chooses to imagine; what, on Mr. Palmer's theory, would *macte uirtute esto* mean? 'Be sprinkled with valour'? This surely is as strange a method of ridding warriors of the pollution of blood as ever was heard of. 'Be hallowed, ennobled by your valour' is more intelligible, but Mr. Palmer rejects this, as we also do, though for different reasons. 'Be ye made pure by your valour' is in itself possible; but until some example is found of a people believing in blood-pollution and at the same time holding that the moral condition of the person who had incurred it would act as a substitute for proper ritual, we need not linger over it.

It appears, then, that none of the passages adduced to support Mr. Palmer really does so when closely examined. We are thus left with the general likeliness of one meaning or the other, 'increased' or 'sprinkled', being right. Here, as it seems to us, one consideration after another tells in favour of the older view. Firstly, we must remember that Cato, in the passages quoted, gives us not only the formula *macte uino inferio esto*, which could without violating common sense or general probability be made to mean 'be sprinkled with this libation of sacrificial wine', but also *macte istace dape pollucenda esto*. Are we to assume that originally it was the custom to throw the *dapes* at the god, or his altar or shrine, so that the food of which it was composed was spattered about? All we know of ritual, at least that of the

¹ So often that even Lewis and Short have heard of it, and that despite the fact that it occurs in Livy; they cite, *inter alia*, Livy v, 17, 2; 19, 1, *s.u. Latinae*.

celestial g
then, can
and the sa
meaning 'm
more than

But n
sider. W
put forwa
remaining
it were inc
tion seems
words, the
esto but si
sacrifice h
the impera
place of a
fossilized
96). Now
it differed
in Roman
least differ
same nam
the ritual,
not be tru
when one
Zeus Acc
plished.¹
aim and o
present to
tioned in a

ST. ANDR

celestial gods, tells us that the food was laid orderly on an altar or a table. How, then, can it be said to 'besprinkle' anyone or anything? It is very strange if in one and the same formula the same ritual word in one clause keeps its supposed original meaning 'besprinkle' and in another has moved so far from it that it signifies no more than a vague 'here is an offering for you'.

But more than this, we have the construction of the phrase *macte esto* to consider. We have mentioned (see note 5, p. 221) two explanations which have been put forward of its syntax, and found both profoundly unsatisfactory. The only remaining possibility, as it seems to us, is to make *macte* a fossilized word, used as if it were indeclinable, though originally it was not. If so, the only possible explanation seems to be that it is a vocative, and as such used originally by itself. In other words, there was a time when worshippers did not say *macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto* but simply cried *macte !* to the god at some point of the rite, presumably after the sacrifice had been made. This *macte !* then came to be used with verbs, first with the imperative and afterwards with other parts, till Livy actually makes it take the place of an acc. sing. (*iuverem macte uirtute esse*, ii, 12, 14). For parallels to such fossilized vocatives we need look no farther than a Homeric grammar (Monro², par. 96). Now what did this vocative mean originally? 'Oh besprinkled one'? If so, it differed from every other intelligible epithet applied to a god which we know of as in Roman usage. They all refer to the functions of the deity, as *dapalis*, *opifera*, or at least differentiate the god or goddess of the particular shrine from some other of the same name, as (*Minerva*) *Capta*. None alludes in this curious way to a mere detail of the ritual, and that too a detail which in some cases, as the offering of a *dapes*, would not be true. But 'Oh thou increased in power!' seems a very natural thing to say when one has just seen to it that that increase should take place, as natural as 'Oh Zeus Accomplisher!' in the mouth of one who badly wants something to be accomplished.¹ To increase the power of a deity by appropriate ritual seems to be the aim and object of ancient sacrifice in its earliest form, before it was thought of as a present to win his favour; it is most understandable that this aim should be mentioned in a Roman equivalent of the Greek *όλολυγή*.

O. SKUTSCH.

H. J. ROSE.

ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY.

¹ Aeschylus, *Agam.* 973.

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Andrewes, A.**, Eunomia, 89 ff.
Aristotle's hymn to virtue, 182 ff.
Armstrong, A. H., the gods in Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, 190 ff.
- Beare, W.**, side-entrances and *παρακτοί* in the Hellenistic theatre, 205 ff.
Bowra, C. M., the epigram on the fallen of Coronea, 80 ff.; Aristotle's hymn to virtue, 182 ff.
- Campbell, A. Y.**, notes on Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 135 f.
Choephoroi, four notes on the, 1 ff.
 Cornelius Gallus, the origin of, 39 ff.
 Coronea, the epigram on the fallen of, 80 ff.
- Democritus' theory of cognition, 47 ff.
 Diodorus Siculus xvi, the sources of, 137 ff.
Dodds, E. R., four notes on the *Choephoroi*, 1 ff.
 Dracontides, the Constitution of, 152 ff.
- Eunomia, 89 ff.
 Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, notes on, 135 f.; *Medea*, a new papyrus fragment of, 45 f.; a new collation of the text in the Jerusalem palimpsest, 197 ff.
- gods in Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, the, 190 ff.
Gow, A. S. F., the thirteenth idyll of Theocritus, 10 ff.
- Hackforth, R.**, the aviary theory in the *Theaetetus*, 27 ff.
Hammond, N. G. L., the sources of Diodorus Siculus xvi, 137 ff.
 Hellenistic theatre, side-entrances and *παρακτοί* in the, 205 ff.
 Herodotus, notes on, 211 ff.
Hirst, Margaret E., the portents in Horace, *Odes* I. 2. (1-20), 7 ff.
 Horace, *Odes* I. 2. 1-20, the portents in, 7 ff.
- Jerusalem palimpsest, a new collation of the text of Euripides in the, 197 ff.
- lexical notes, 109 ff.
Lockwood, J. F., further lexical notes, 109 ff.
Lorimer, H. L., *πρόλος* and *πυλῆες*, 129 ff.
Lucas, Hans, Martial's *Kalendae Nataliciae*, 5 f.
- mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
macte, mactare, macula, 57 ff.
 Martial's *Kalendae Nataliciae*, 5 f.
- Munro, J. A. R.**, Theramenes against Lysander, 18 ff.; the Constitution of Dracontides, 152 ff.
Murphy, N. R., the 'comparison of lives' in Plato's *Philebus*, 116 ff.
- Page, Denys**, a new papyrus fragment of Euripides' *Medea*, 45 f.
Palmer, L. R., *macte, mactare, macula*, 57 ff.
Περὶ Τύχης, the authorship of the, 133 f.
 Philodemus on *ethos* in music, 174 ff.
 Plato, Plotinus, Epicurus, the gods in, 190 ff.
 Plato's *Philebus*, the 'comparison of lives' in, 116 ff.
 Plutarch's *Timoleon*, the sources of, 65 ff.
Powell, J. E., the archetype of Thucydides, 75 ff.; the Cretan manuscripts of, 103 ff.; notes on Herodotus (third article), 211 ff.
πρόλος and *πυλῆες*, 129 ff.
- Richards, G. C.**, the authorship of the *Περὶ Τύχης*, 133 f.
Rose, H. J., and O. Skutsch, *mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
- Skutsch, O.**, and H. J. Rose, *mactare—macula*?, 220 ff.
 Socrates, the pseudo-Platonic, 167 ff.
Spranger, J. A., a new collation of the text of Euripides in the Jerusalem palimpsest, 197 ff.
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS:
 American Journal of Philology, 126 ff.
 Classical Philology, 125
 Indogerm. Forschungen, 63 f., 128
 Neue Jahrbücher, 63, 128
 Philologus, 63
- Syme, R.**, the origin of Cornelius Gallus, 39 ff.
- Tarrant, Dorothy**, the pseudo-Platonic Socrates, 167 ff.
Theaetetus, the aviary theory in the, 27 ff.
 Theocritus, the thirteenth idyll of, 10 ff.
 Theramenes against Lysander, 18 ff.
 Thucydides, the archetype of, 75 ff.; the Cretan manuscripts of, 103 ff.
- Todd, O. J.**, *Τριταγωνιστής*: a reconsideration, 30 ff.
Τριταγωνιστής: a reconsideration, 30 ff.
- Weiss, Helene**, Democritus' theory of cognition, 47 ff.
Westlake, H. D., the sources of Plutarch's *Timoleon*, 65 ff.
- Wilkinson, L. P.**, Philodemus on *ethos* in music, 174 ff.

Aelian :—
 V. H.
 Aeschines
 ii. (19)
 90;
 Aeschylus
 Ag. (9)
 Cho. (1)
 (824)
 Sept.
 Supp.
 Alcman :—
 fr. (44)
 Ammonius
 de diff.
 Anacreon
 (Diehl)
 Andocides
 i. (99)
 18;
 Ant. Lib. :—
 (26)=
 Apollonius
 ii. (707)
 16
 Ariphron :—
 (Diehl)
 Aristides
 (p. 95)
 Aristophan.
 Ach. (1)
 Av. (4)
 Ran. (1)
 Aristotle :—
 'Aperá.
 A.P. i.
 (23-2)
 Ath. P.
 (3),
 (1),
 25,
 (1),
 de anim.
 de gen.
 (325)
 de somn.
 Eth. N.
 (1112)
 Metaph.
 (105)
 53
 Pol. (1)
 (133)
 (134)
 178
 [Proble.
 Rhet. ii.
 Top. ii.
 Aristoxenus
 ii. (31),
 Arnobius :—
 adv. nat.
 Athenaeus :—
 xv. (69)
 Augustine :—
 Conf. x.
 Bacchylides :—
 xii. (15)

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

- Aelian:—
V.H. viii. (19), 186
- Aeschines:—
 ii. (19), 36; (76), 20; iii. (133), 81; v. (31), 90; [*Epist.*] xii. (1), 32
- Aeschylus:—
Ag. (973), 223; (1481 ff.), 4
Cho. (283 ff.), 1 f.; (375 ff.), 2; (481-2), 2 f.; (824 ff.), 3 f.; (909-11), 4
Sept. (194), 4
Supp. (905), 80
- Alcman:—
 fr. (44), 89; *see also* 101
- Ammonius:—
de diff. Verb. pp. 52, 54 (Valcknaer), 186
- Anacreon:—
 (Diehl fr. 102. 1-2), 87
- Andocides:—
 i. (99), 24; i. (142), 20; iii. (11-12), 18; (12), 18; (21), 20; (31), (39), 19
- Ant. Lib.*:—
 (26) = Nicand. fr. (48), 11
- Apollonius Rhodius:—
 ii. (707), 13; (1207), 15; (1254-5), 14; (1262), 16
- Ariphron:—
 (Diehl ii. p. 131), 182; (4-7), 183
- Aristides Quintilianus:—
 (p. 95M), 178
- Aristophanes:—
Ach. (18), 1
Av. (451-9), (539-47), 184
Ran. (258), 11; (1052 f.), 36
- Aristotle:—
Aperá. Hymn to, 182 ff.; (9-11), 188
A.P. 1449a. (15-19), 30; (16 ff.), 31; 1451b. (23-26), 36
Ath. Pol. 4. (3), 165; 30. (2), 161, 163; 30. (3), 163; 31. (3), 164; 33. (2), 165; 34. (1), 20; 34. (3), 18, 19, 23, 153; 35. (1), 25, 155 f., 158; 35. (3), 36. (1), 156; 37. (1), 162; 37. (2), 161; 39. (6), 25
de anima i. 2. (404a. 27), 47 ff.
de gen. et corr. i. 1. (315b. 6 ff.), 51 f.; i. 8. (325a. 13), (325a. 23-27), 50
de somniis 462a. (12), 1 f.
Eth. Nic. ii. 1. (1103a. 26, 27), 188; iii. 3. (1112a. 23)
Metaph. iii. (1009b. 12), 47 ff.; (1010a. 1-3), (1051b. 23-4), 54; (1051b. 23), 55; iv. (3), 53
Pol. (1294a), 91; (1307a), 95; (1337a), 179; (1338b. 29 f.), 31; (1339), 175; (1339a), 180; (1340a), 178; (1341a), 177; viii. (5, 8, 9), 178
[*Problem* xix. (27)], 177
Rhet. iii. 5. 5. (1407b), 84
Top. ii. (611b. 22), 187; (Diehl fr. 3), 88
- Aristoxenus:—
 ii. (31), 175
- Arnobius:—
adv. nat. iv. (16), vii. (31), 221
- Athenaeus:—
 xv. (694a), 185; (696a), 182
- Augustine:—
Conf. x. (33), 178
- Bacchylides:—
 xii. (158), 89; xiii. (175-181), 187
- Callimachus:—
Bath of Pallas (85 ff.), 87
H. i. (52), iii. (240), 129
- Cato:—
agr. 132. (1), 59, 61, 220 f.; 134. (3), 59, 220 f.; 134. (4), 61
- Cicero:—
ad fam. x. 32. (5), 39
de fin. i. (71), 180
in Verrem ii. 3. (69), 5. (181), 42
poem. de cons. (Div. i. 18), 60
Val. (14), 61
- Corinna:—
 (Diehl fr. 5, 74-8), 83 f.
- Cornelius Nepos:—
Lys. (1), 19
- Democritus:—
 fr. B. (11), 48
- Demosthenes:—
 xviii. (129), 35; (180), 36; (209), (262), (265), (267), 35; xix. (10), 32; (65), 20; (199 f.), 35; (246 f.), 34; (247), 30; (337), 35; xlii. (25, 32), 19; *de Cor.* (289), 86
- Dio Cassius:—
 xlv. (17), 7; liii. 23. (5), 39
- Diodorus:—
 vii. (fr. 12, 1 Vogel), 90 f., 95 f.; xiii. (107), 19; xiv. (3), 19, 23, 155, 156; (4), 154, 156; (10), (13), 19; (32), 160, 162; xv. (63), 20; xvi. 5. (1), 137; 70. (5), 140; 71. (3), 143; 76. (6), 149; 82. (6), 140 f.
- Diogenes Laertius:—
 v. (27), 182; x. (6), 181
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus:—
Ep. ad Pompeium, 133
- Ephorus:—
F.G.H. 70 f. (149), 101
- Epicurus:—
Letter to Menoeceus iii. 12. (4), 194
- Euphorion:—
A.P. vi. (279-82), 13
- Euripides:—
Andr. (103-16), 86
Cycl. (658), 1
Hec. (67), 81
H.F. (1041), 81
Hel. (891), 136
I.T. (116-7), (183), (219), (412), (413), (573 f.), 135; (591-2), (633), (819), (1055), (1386), 136
Med. (1156-60), 46; (1165-77), 45; (1191-9), 46
Phoen. (844), 81
- Eustathius:—
 (600, 45 ff.), 130
- Heliodorus:—
Aethiop. vi. (14), 1
- Herodotus:—
 i. (65-66), 92 f.; (97), 89; ii. (124), 90; v. (89), 83; *see pp.* 211-19 *passim*
- Hesiod:—
Op. (289-93), 187
- Homer:—
Iliad v. (744), xi. (49), 129; xi. (462), 11; xii. (77), xv. (517), xxi. (90), 129

Homer—continued:—

Od. vi. (66), 3; ix. (34), 183; xii. (194), 1; xvii. (485 f.), 89 f.; xxii. (299-301), 12

Hom. Hymn.:—

iii. (91-2), 80; iv. (561), 83; xxx. (11), 90; *Hermes* (562-3), 84

Horace:—

Epod. ii. (70), 6
Odes i. 2. (1-20), 7 ff.; (49-50), 7; i. 35. (33-4), (38-40), ii. i. (6-8), 9; iv. 13. (8), 183
Sat. i. 3. (87), 6

[Inscriptions]:—

I.G. iii. i. (171), iv². i. (132), 182; Kaibel no. 243. (12), 183

Ion of Chios:—

(Diehl fr. 8. 1-2), 88

Isidorus:—

Ethym. vi. 19. (17), 186

Isocrates:—

viii. (20), 19; xiv. (31), xviii. (29), 20; (40), 24

Licymnius:—

185

Livy:—

ii. 12. (14), 223

Lucian:—

Peregr. (36), 32
Pro Lapsu (6), 182
Tyr. (22), 34

Lysias:—

xii. (43), 18; (50), 21; (55), 159; (62), (64), 21; (68-9), 20; (69, 70), 21; (70), 20; (71-76), 24, 156 f.; (71), 153; (73), 152; (76), 160; (77), 19; (78), (84-5), 21; xiii. (5), 19; (7 ff.), 18; (7), 25; (8), 19 f.; (9-11), 21; (9-10), 20; (11), 22; (12), 19; (13-17), 23; (14), 19, 20; (17), 25; (30), 23; (30-34), 25; xxx. (7, 8), 161; (10-14), 19

Macedonius:—

Paeon (27-8), 185

Macrobius:—

Sat. i. 15. (18), (19), 6

Manilius:—

ii. (8-10), (57-8), 134

Martial:—

iv. 66. (3), viii. 44. (11), 6; viii. (64), 5; x. 63. (5), xii. 32. (1), 6

Mela:—

ii. (75), 43

Menander:—

Hypobol. frg. 484. (K), 34
Theophr. frg. 223 (K), (16 f.), 34

Mimnermus:—

fr. i. (3), 183

Ovid:—

Am. i. 15. (29), 39
Met. xv. (782-98), 7

Papyri:—

Hib. Pap. i. (13), 179

Pausanias:—

i. 29. (6), 85; ii. 11. (6), 186

Περὶ Τύχης:—

(36), 133 f.; xiii. (3), (4), 134

Philodemus:—

περὶ μουσικῆς i. (fr. 18), 177; iii. (fr. 52), 178, 179; iv. (col. 2), 177; (col. 3), 176; (col. 11, 18), 179; (col. 14, 8-13), (col. 16), 181; (col. 24), 178 f.; (col. 26, 5), 180; (col. 29, 12 ff.), 175; (col. 29, 32-5), (col. 36), 180; (col. 38), 181; v. (col. 29, 17), 175

Philodemus—continued:—

περὶ πικρανῶν iv. (col. 4), (col. 8), 176; v. (col. 29), 180

Phrynichus:—

(fr. 13 Nauck), 183

Pindar:—

Isthm. i. (5), 183
Nem. i. (67-8), 81; iv. (84), 184
Ol. ix. (110), 81; x. (4, fr. 194), 186
Pyth. i. (48), 81; iv. (188), 12

Plato:—

[*Alcib. Prior*] (103a), (105a), (105d), 171
Apol. 31 (d), 170 f.; 40 (b), 41 (d), 170
[*Axioch.*] 365 (a), 368 (d), 369 (b), 170; 372 (a), 168
Epist. vii. 324 (c), 25
[*Evastae*] 139 (a), 168, 169; 132 (b), 169
[*Hipp. Maj.*] 304 (d), 168
Laus 668 (a), 179; 668 (b), 176; (669), 177; (669 ff.), 175; (728 ff.), 120; 753 (b), 162; 905 (d)-907 (b), 192
[*Opot*] 413 (e), 91
Phileb. 11 (b), 117
Rep. 339 (b), 177; 380 (d), 188; (398-400), 175; 414 (b), 162; 443 (d), (e), 119; 537 (a-d), 162; 581 (b), 119; 581 (e), 116; (581-3), (583-6), 116
Theaet. 195. b. (9), 196. (b), 199. (b), 27; 199. (c-d), 27 f.; 199. (e), 200. (b), 28; 200. b. (1-2), 28 f.; 200. b. (5), 29; (Diehl no. 6), 87
[*Theages*] 128 (d), 171; 128 (e), 129 (a), (d), (e), 131 (a), 172

Plautus:—

Amph. (1062), (1067), (1130), (1143), 209

Pliny the Elder:—

N.H. iii. (130), 40; xxxiii. (143), 41; xxxv. (70, 137), 187

Pliny the Younger:—

Ep. vii. 27. (§ 9), 1

Plotinus:—

Περὶ Ἰπποκράτους iii. 2. (9), 193 f.; iii. 2 (p. 484 Creuz.), 31

Plutarch:—

Lycurgus v. (4), 91; (vi), 95
Lysand. (13), (14), 19; (15), 20, 26; (21), 21, 23; (23), 31; (26), 100
Mor. 318 (a), 89
Nic. (17), 86
non posse . . . (12), 181; (13), 180
Per. (18), 85
Prac. Ger. Reip. 21. (816f-817a), 31
Qu. Rom. (11), 186
Simp. Quaest. i. i. (5), 185

Pollux:—

iv. (124), 31; (125-7), 206

Polyaenus:—

i. 45. (5), 20

[Pseudo-Xenophon]:—

'Αθ. πολ. i. (5, 8), 90

Sallust:—

Cat. (51), 156

Scholia:—

in Demosth. v. (6), xix. (247), 32
in Eur. Phoen. (95), 31
(T) *in Hom. Il.* xii. (77), xxiii. (130), 130
in Nic. Ther. (15), 83
in Pind. Pyth. ii. (127), 130
in Plat. Gorg. (451e), 185

Seneca:—

Ep. lxvi. (50), 61 f., 222; lxxxviii. (5), 181

Servius:—

iv. (57), 61; *in Aen.* ix. (641), 57 f.

Sextus:—

D.V. 68a. (59), 51

Simonides:—

(Diehl fr. 1-2), 88

Sophocles:—

Ant. (783), 183
O.C. (653), 183
Trach. (45), 183
(Pearson)

Strabo:—

(300-301), 183

Strattis:—

frg. i. (K), 183

Suidas:—

s.v. 'Αβροχάρης

Tacitus:—

Ann. xi. (1), 183

Theocritus:—

xiii. (7), 183

Thucydides:—

i. (18), 9

(22, 2), 78; iv. 78; (78), 76; (67), 76

Tibullus:—

i. i. (36 f.), 183

Simonides:—

(Diehl fr. 37), 187; (83. 3-4), 81; (120. 1-2), 88

Sophocles:—

Ant. (783-4), 183

O.C. (653), 2

Trach. (497-517), 184; (1164-73), 84

(Pearson fr. 361), 187; (771), 85

Strabo:—

(300-301), 89; (362), 95

Strattis:—

frg. 1. (K), 34

Suidas:—

s.v. 'Αβρογάστης, 32; s.v. Σοφοκλῆς, 32

Tacitus:—

Ann. xi. (24), xiii. (27), 41

Theocritus:—

xiii. (7), (10), 13; (14), 13 f.; (22), (23), 14; (46), 15; (64), 12; (108), 15 f.; (73), 16 f.

Thucydides:—

i. (18), 93 ff.; (89. 1-3), 78; ii. (17. 2), 84; (22. 2), 85; (36. 4), 78; (42. 4), 77; (63. 1), 78; iv. (28. 3), 76; v. (26), 22; vii. (70. 8), 78; (78. 6), 76; (81. 3), 77; viii. (10. 1), 76; (67), 155; (68), 18

Tibullus:—

i. 1. (36 f.), 61; i. 2. (47 f.), 61; ii. 5. (71 ff.), 7

Tyrtaeus:—

fr. 1. (12), 96; 9. (18), 81; see also 95 ff.

Varro:—

fr. Non. 341. (34), 61; *Menipp.* 2 (Bue.), 222

Virgil:—

Aen. ii. (717 ff.), 62; vi. (229 ff.), 61

Georg. i. (466-488), 7

Vitruvius:—

V. vi. (§ 8), 206

Xenophon:—

Eq. ii. (1), 162

Hell. i. 7. (35), 19; ii. 1. (4), (22-34), (22), (25), (28), (38), 187; ii. 2. (3), (10), 20; (11), 19; (13), (14), 20; (16), 20, 22; (16-19), 21; (17), (18), (19), (19-22), (20), 22; ii. 3 (1-3), 152; (1-14), 154; (2, 3), 24; (3), 25; (7), 19, 155; (8), 154; (8, 9), 26; (13), 156; (15), 18; (17), 24, 155; (18), 159; (20), 161; (21), 158; (24), 18; (25-26), 24, 154 f.; (41), 158; (48), (51), 162; ii. 4. (2), 161; (8), 159; (9), (10), 161; (21), 154; (29), 21; iii. 4. (2), 19, 23; (7), (13), 19; iii. 5. (8), 20; vi. 5. (35, 46), 20

Hipparch. i. (11-12), (17-19), 162; ix. (3), 162

Mem. i. 1. (3), (4), 171

E.
A se
is to
of th

W

M
to
F
th
B
L
V
S

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D. W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB

Each volume, Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.
A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

New Volumes, Spring and Summer, 1938

Latin

331. *Ammianus Marcellinus*. Three volumes. Vol. III (Books 27-32). Translated by J. C. ROLFE.
304, 336. *Celsus. DE MEDICINA*. Three volumes. Vols. II and III. Translated by Dr. W. G. SPENCER.
332. *Liuy*. Thirteen volumes. Vol. XII (Books 40-42). Translated by the late EVAN T. SAGE and A. C. SCHLESINGER.
328. *Plautus*. Five volumes. Vol. V: STICHUS, TRINUMMUS, TRUCULENTUS, VIDULARIA, FRAGMENTS. Translated by PAUL NIXON.
329. *Remains of Old Latin*. Four volumes. Vol. III: LUCILIUS, LAWS OF THE XII TABLES. Translated by E. H. WARMINGTON.
330. *Pliny. NATURAL HISTORY*. Ten volumes. Vol. I (Books 1 and 2). Translated by H. RACKHAM.
333, 334. *Varro. DE LINGUA LATINA*. Two volumes. Translated by ROLAND G. KENT.

Greek

325. *Aristotle. ORGANON*. Two volumes. Vol. I: CATEGORIES, ON INTERPRETATION, translated by H. P. COOKE; PRIOR ANALYTICS, translated by H. TREDENNICK.
338. *Aristotle. ON THE HEAVENS*. Translated by W. K. C. GUTHRIE.
Machines or Mind? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).
Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

DURA-EUPOPOS AND ITS ART

By M. ROSTOVTZEFF

With 24 plates, as well as text figures and maps

15/- net

A fully illustrated account of the recent archæological discoveries at the famous caravan city of Dura in Syria

PORTRAIT OF SOCRATES

By SIR RICHARD LIVINGSTONE

6/- net

'... This is a book to read, to think about and to talk about and then read again...'—*Northern Whig*

'... It is hard to see how the work could have been better done...'—*A.M.A.*

QUINTILIAN ON EDUCATION

*A Translation of Selected Passages from the
Institutio Oratoria
with an Essay on*

Quintilian, His Environment and His Theory of Education

By W. M. SMAIL

4/6 net

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

